



HARVARD COLLEGE  
LIBRARY



GIFT OF THE  
GOVERNMENT  
OF THE UNITED STATES









INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE  
ST. LOUIS, MO., AREA—PART 1

---

---

HEARING  
BEFORE THE  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

—  
JUNE 4, 1956  
—

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

(INDEX IN PART 4 OF THIS SERIES)



HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY  
DEPOSITED BY THE  
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

OCT 5 1956

UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1956

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., Tennessee

EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

RICHARD ARENS, *Director*



# CONTENTS

---

## Executive Hearings (See Part 3)<sup>1</sup>

	Page
June 2, 1956: Testimony of—	
Joseph John Schoemehl.....	4949
Loyal Hammack.....	4966
George V. L. Hardy.....	4971
June 4, 1956: Testimony of—	
Joseph John Schoemehl (resumed).....	4979
Obadiah Jones.....	4981

## Public Hearings

### PART 1

June 4, 1956: Testimony of—	
William W. Cortor.....	4724
Afternoon session:	
William W. Cortor (resumed).....	4758
James H. Sage.....	4761
Elliott Waxman.....	4784
Leslie S. Davison.....	4793
Sol S. Nissen.....	4794
John William Simpson.....	4798

### PART 2

June 5, 1956: Testimony of—	
John William Simpson (resumed).....	4803
William Henry Holland.....	4808
Harvey John Day.....	4818
Thelma Hecht (Mrs. Julius Hecht).....	4825
Brockman Schumacher.....	4829
Thomas A. Younglove.....	4834
Afternoon session:	
Thomas A. Younglove (resumed).....	4845
Orville Leach.....	4864
Zollie C. Carpenter.....	4869
James Payne.....	4876
Helen Aukamp Sage (Mrs. James H. Sage).....	4883

### PART 3

June 6, 1956: Testimony of—	
Dr. Sol Londe.....	4889
William Edwin Davis.....	4895
Ida Holland (Mrs. William Henry Holland).....	4899
Edwin Leslie Richardson.....	4902
Anne (Ann) Yagur Kling.....	4912
Afternoon session:	
Anne (Ann) Yagur Kling (resumed).....	4920
Gilbert Harold Hall.....	4940
Richard L. Stanford.....	4944
Romey Hudson.....	4945

<sup>1</sup> Released by the committee August 24, 1956, and ordered to be printed.

PART 4

	<b>Page</b>
June 8, 1956: Testimony of—	
Helen Musiel.....	4993
Hershel James Walker.....	5000
George Kimmel.....	5004
Hershel James Walker (recalled).....	5014
Linus E. Wampler.....	5017
George Kimmel (recalled).....	5026
Afternoon session:	
Dr. John F Rutledge.....	5028
Ella Mae Posey Pappademos.....	5051
Clara Perkins (Mrs. Haven Perkins).....	5058
Haven Perkins.....	5065
Julius Hecht.....	5069
Sol Derman.....	5070
Douglas MacLeod.....	5072
Index.....	i

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress (1946), chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, \* \* \**

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

- \* \* \* \* \*  
17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

- \* \* \* \* \*  
(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American Activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

# RULES ADOPTED BY THE 84TH CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 5, 1955

\* \* \* \* \*

## RULE X

### STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress:

\* \* \* \* \*

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

\* \* \* \* \*

## RULE XI

### POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

\* \* \* \* \*

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make, from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

# INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE ST. LOUIS, MO., AREA—PART 1

MONDAY, JUNE 4, 1956

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,  
*St. Louis, Mo.*

## PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met at 10 a. m., pursuant to call, in room No. 3, United States Courthouse and Customs Building, St. Louis, Mo.; Hon. Morgan M. Moulder (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Morgan M. Moulder, of Missouri; James B. Frazier, Jr., of Tennessee; and Gordon H. Scherer, of Ohio.

Staff members present: Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; George C. Williams and Raymond T. Collins, investigators.

Mr. MOULDER. The subcommittee will come to order.

Let the record show that the Honorable Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the United States House of Representatives, pursuant to law and the rules of this committee, has duly appointed a subcommittee for the purpose of conducting this hearing, composed of Representatives James B. Frazier, Jr., of Tennessee, who sits on my left, Gordon H. Scherer, of Ohio, who sits on my right, and myself, Morgan M. Moulder, of Missouri, as chairman.

The Chair desires to make the following statement which has been prepared and approved by all of the members of this committee.

This committee has devoted much time to the investigation of the subject of communism, and has endeavored to keep Congress well informed regarding the extent, character, and objects of the Communist conspiracy in this country.

This is a continuation of similar investigations held in many of the most vital industrial cities in our Nation. In the performance of this work the committee has made reports to Congress prior to the present 84th Congress in which 48 recommendations were made for new legislation or for the strengthening of existing legislation designed to aid in the fight against subversive communism. All but four of these recommendations have been enacted, in one form or another, into law by the Congress of the United States. Among these are the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, the Communist Control Act of 1954, and the Immunity Act.

The purpose of this hearing is to investigate the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities which emanate from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and which attack the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, as well as all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation, with special reference to Communist infiltration in industrial plants, in mass organizations, and in the professions.

It has been duly established by testimony before congressional committees and before the courts of our land that the Communist Party of the United States is a part of an international conspiracy which is being used as a tool or weapon by a foreign power to promote its own foreign policy, and which has for its object the overthrow of the governments of all non-Communist countries, resorting to the use of force, if necessary.

Communism cannot successfully exist in our country except by the promulgation and diffusion of subversive and un-American propaganda, and, in the opinion of this committee, every person who remains a member of the Communist Party is contributing to the ultimate accomplishment of the objectives of the Communist Party.

Communism and Communist activities cannot be investigated in a vacuum. Therefore, it is necessary, if Congress is to legislate intelligently on the subject, to call as witnesses those whom the committee has reason to believe have knowledge on the subject. This the committee proposes to do in the discharge of the responsibilities placed upon us by the Congress of the United States. From such knowledge acquired it is the hope of the committee that legislative means may be found to more adequately protect our form of government and our country and our American way of life from the threat of this international Communist conspiracy.

The leaders of the Soviet Union have recently launched a new tactical maneuver which is dangerous for the United States. They have adopted new tactics to weaken and discredit anticommunism within the United States.

The general approach of this new policy is to appear more conciliatory, and to encourage non-Communist countries to make concessions in the name of a false Communist spirit of peace and civil liberties which we in America hold dear and have always sought and defended.

They seek to smear this committee. They seek to dismantle anti-Communist legislation and achieve a false, so-called peaceful coexistence which will not resist future Soviet aggression and Communist subversion.

The military might of the Soviet Union remains intact, and the dictatorial leaders of the Communist Soviet Union now control and direct more than one-third of the entire world.

The new Communist policy is shrewdly designed to lull the American people into complacency, inertia, and ultimately achieve the ripe opportunity for world communism under the iron heel of Soviet totalitarianism.

We the members of this committee, and our hard-working staff of counsel and investigators, are not deceived by the new Communist propaganda, and we are not going to be stampeded or discouraged in the work delegated to us by the Congress of the United States.

And we will not relax our fight against the spread of communism because of unjust criticism and because of smokescreen smear attacks on us as individuals or as a committee by the Communist Party and their fellow travelers.

The committee wants it understood that in the conduct of this hearing we are not interested in any dispute between labor and management or between one union and another union.

Neither are we interested in the internal affairs of any labor union.

We propose to ascertain the facts regarding Communist schemes and the activities of individuals affiliated with them, whether that be in the field of labor or in any other field, so that Congress will be enabled to legislate more ably and comprehensively on the subject.

It is the standing rule of this committee that any person identified as a member of the Communist Party during the course of the committee hearings be given an early opportunity to appear before this committee, if he desires, for the purpose of denying, affirming, or explaining any testimony adversely affecting him. If this be any person's desire, he should communicate with a member of the staff.

The committee has observed from the press that 10 days prior to this hearing the bar association of St. Louis offered its services to any witness subpoenaed to appear before this committee who is unable to obtain the services of an attorney.

As pointed out by the press, the committee, not being a court, is without power to appoint counsel for witnesses. However, the committee for many years has encouraged witnesses to secure counsel, and, on a number of occasions, has requested local bar associations to furnish counsel for witnesses. Notable examples of instances in which local bars have rendered outstanding services to witnesses at the suggestion of this committee are Seattle, Wash., and Flint, Mich. We earnestly compliment the bar association of St. Louis for its action in this matter, especially in view of the fact that it was without any suggestion on the part of the committee.

May I make it clear that an attorney who appears before this committee as counsel for a witness, that that fact should not in itself be taken as any disparagement or reflection whatsoever against the lawyer for doing so, because he is so representing the witness as a part of his duty in the conduct of his work in his profession as a lawyer. And we invite and encourage counsel to be present.

I would remind those present that we are here as Members of Congress and as authorized and directed by the Congress of the United States to discharge a duty placed upon us by Public Law 601.

Spectators are here by permission of the committee, and I trust that throughout the hearings you will conduct yourselves as guests of the committee.

A disturbance of any kind or audible comment during the course of the testimony, whether favorable or unfavorable to any witness or to the committee, will not be tolerated. For any infraction of this rule the offender or offenders will be ejected from the hearing room.

I trust it is only necessary to call this matter to your attention, and that it will not be necessary to repeat it.

In accordance with the rules of the House of Representatives, there will be no telecast or radio broadcast of testimony or proceedings had by this committee in this hearing room.

Still photography is not permitted while a witness is testifying.

Please observe the rules of the Federal court that there be no smoking in the room.

Call your first witness, please, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. William W. Cortor.

Will you come forward, please.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. CORTOR. I do.

Mr. TAVENNER. Please be seated.

### TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM W. CORTOR

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. CORTOR. It is William W. Cortor, spelled C-o-r-t-o-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Cortor, it is the practice of the committee to advise all witnesses that they are entitled to have counsel present with them if they so desire, and to confer with counsel at any time during the course of their testimony. I wanted you to know that you have that right if you desire to exercise it.

When and where were you born, Mr. Cortor?

Mr. CORTOR. I was born in Saint Francis County, Mo., on March 4, 1912.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. CORTOR. 1859 Irving Place, Wellston, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been?

Mr. CORTOR. I finished grammar school, and had a little training in business college. That is the extent of my formal education.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is the general nature of your present employment?

Mr. CORTOR. I am employed on the towboats operated on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers by various private companies.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Cortor, have you had an occasion in the past to become a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the circumstances under which you first became a member?

Mr. CORTOR. It was back in 1938 while I was on strike at the Emerson Electric Co. plant here in St. Louis that I first came in contact with the Young Communist League during my strike activities. And in the following September I joined the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you employed at the Emerson Electric Co. at the time you mentioned?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did I understand you to say that you first became a member of the Young Communist League?

Mr. CORTOR. That is correct.



Mr. TAVENNER. Tell the committee, please, how you became a member, and the circumstances under which you became a member of the Young Communist League.

Mr. CORTOR. Well, I was very active in the organization of Emerson Electric and also in the conduct of the strike when I was approached by Henry Fiering and asked if I had ever read anything of Communist literature or anything of that type. And I told him "No."

So he invited me to attend the meeting of the Young Communist League, which I attended, and joined the Young Communist League during that meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. At this point, will you tell us a little more about Henry Fiering. Other than his Communist Party activities, in what work was he engaged?

Mr. CORTOR. He was a strike leader at the Century Electric Co. which was on strike at the same time as Emerson.

Mr. TAVENNER. At what plant?

Mr. CORTOR. The Century Electric Co.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he was at that time or at a later time an official in a union?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What union?

Mr. CORTOR. The United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall what position he held in the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, in 1945 he was international representative working in the Dayton area, Dayton, Ohio, area, for the UE.

Mr. SCHERER. In what year was he working in the Dayton area?

Mr. CORTOR. 1945.

Mr. SCHERER. When was the Univis strike in Dayton, counsel? He said this man Fiering was active in the Dayton area in about 1945. Do you recall the date of the Univis strike in Dayton?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir. That was in 1948.

I may say to the subcommittee that Mr. Fiering was called as a witness before this committee on August 30, 1950, and was asked various questions relating to alleged Communist Party activities engaged in by him. But he refused to answer material questions on the ground that to do so might tend to incriminate him.

Now you say that it was this Mr. Henry Fiering who brought you into the Young Communist League in 1938?

Mr. CORTOR. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long after that was it that you became a member of the Communist Party itself?

Mr. CORTOR. It was in September of the same year.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did that occur?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, I was called in to the party office, which at that time was at Vandeventer and Olive, and informed that my name had been submitted as a candidate for a national fulltime training school to be held somewhere in upstate New York. And I told the person at that time that I didn't feel that I was eligible for such a

school due to the fact that I wasn't a member of the Communist Party.

At that time they gave me an application, which I filled out for membership in the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. After filling out your membership requirements, were you selected for this training school?

Mr. CORTOR. No. I was rejected by the National office of the Communist Party due to the fact that I hadn't been a member of the party long enough.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was selected in your place?

Mr. CORTOR. Antonia Sentner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, this is the same training school or school for the training of leadership in the Communist Party about which the committee has received considerable evidence in the past.

Will you tell the committee, please, if you can recall at this time, the other persons who entered the Young Communist League at the same time or approximately the same time that Henry Fiering induced you to become a member?

Mr. CORTOR. Mr. Louis Kimmel joined the same night I did, and his brother George joined shortly afterward.

Mr. TAVENNER. The spelling of the name Kimmel is K-i-m-m-e-l, is it not?

Mr. CORTOR. Correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did they also become members of the Communist Party with you?

Mr. CORTOR. Not at the same time. I don't know just when the two officially joined the Communist Party, but they did join later on.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think I will ask you at this time to give the committee the names of the leaders of the Communist Party in St. Louis at the time you became a member or shortly thereafter.

Mr. CORTOR. Mr. Alfred Wagenknecht was a district organizer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the staff has investigated the correct spelling of that name, and it is W-a-g-e-n-k-n-e-c-h-t.

What position did he hold in the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. He was a district organizer or State chairman of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well, sir, if you will proceed.

Mr. CORTOR. And his wife, Carolyn Drew, was also a leading party person. Exactly what position she held in the State apparatus I could not say at this time.

There were William and Antonia Sentner, Henry Fiering, and Clara Wernick.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell Wernick?

Mr. CORTOR. W-e-r-n-i-c-k.

Mr. TAVENNER. I interrupted you. What were you going to tell the committee regarding her?

Mr. CORTOR. She was also the State chairman of the Young Communist League at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was she the wife of Henry Fiering?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

There was also Ralph Shaw and his wife Sarah. Otto Miller.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the last?

Mr. CORTOR. Otto Miller.

Mr. TAVENNER. Otto Miller?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that the same individual who was subsequently deported?

Mr. CORTOR. To the best of my knowledge he is.

Mr. SCHERER. Why was he deported, counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. It was pursuant to the immigration laws in connection with an immigration hearing.

Do you know what position of leadership he had in any union?

Mr. CORTOR. Not during that period. He was a full-time functionary for the Communist Party at that time. He later became head of one of the plants in the Amalgamated Local of the UE here in St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. He was an official of the UE, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America?

Mr. CORTOR. He was an official of one of the locals. Whether he had a title in the district or not I couldn't say.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he was president of that local or not?

Mr. CORTOR. I believe he was. I could not swear definitely that he was a president. But he was a high official in the local.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether that local was 819?

Mr. CORTOR. I believe it was. Either local 819 or 810.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are not certain of the number of the local?

Mr. CORTOR. The Benjamin Air Rifle plant is where he worked.

Mr. MOULDER. May I interrupt, Mr. Tavenner, at this point?

If the witness can, when naming persons and identifying them as Communist Party members, if possible and wherever possible, it has been the rule of this committee to ask the witness to give any specific description or identification of this person as much as possible so that the name may not be confused with other persons who might not have been members of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. With what other leaders of the Communist Party did you become acquainted in your Communist Party activities whose names you have not mentioned?

Mr. CORTOR. The leaders in that period—

Mr. TAVENNER. Let me ask you if you were acquainted with Robert Manewitz.

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. The correct spelling of the name, Mr. Chairman, according to the committee's investigation, is M-a-n-e-w-i-t-z.

How long did you remain in the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. It was up until the fall of 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you then become a member again at a later period?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes, in the early spring of 1951.

Mr. TAVENNER. And then how long did you remain active in the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. Until the trial of the Smith Act defendants that was held here in St. Louis in this courtroom.

Mr. TAVENNER. In 1954?

Mr. CORTOR. In 1954, that is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was your identity as a member of the Communist Party disclosed at that time?

Mr. CORTOR. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. Also, including your identity at that time as a person who had been working in the Communist Party at the request of the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. CORTOR. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. So that your membership in the Communist Party was from 1938 until 1954—that is, your active membership—except during the period from 1947 to 1951?

Mr. CORTOR. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. I wish you would tell the committee, please, at this time what the organizational setup of the Communist Party was when you first became a member of it and as you progressed in it.

Mr. CORTOR. Well, at that time the party apparatus was set up on the basis of neighborhood branches and also industrial branches and fractions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall how many neighborhood branches or groups of the Communist Party there were in St. Louis?

Mr. CORTOR. At that period of time it would be hard for me to say because I wasn't involved too much in neighborhood work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you, from your recollection, identify any of those groups at the time that you went into it?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, there was one group that met at the Vanguard Book Shop at 3528 Franklin Avenue, and another group that met at 1383 Goodfellow.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt at this point to clarify one thing?

Were you an undercover agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation when you first joined the party in 1947?

Mr. CORTOR. 1938. No, sir; I wasn't.

Mr. SCHERER. 1938 I mean.

Mr. CORTOR. But in the last period I was in the party.

Mr. SCHERER. You reentered the Communist Party in 1951 then at the request of the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were telling us about the second group, neighborhood group. I did not understand what area you said they were from.

Mr. CORTOR. They were from the West Side. It was one of the West Side groups, and they met at 1383 Goodfellow.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell us what people generally made up that West Side group of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, the good proportion of the membership of that group were members of the International Workers Order. And the building, so I understand, that they met in was owned by the International Workers Order.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of industrial groups. Will you tell the committee the number of industrial groups, as far as you can recall, during this early period of your membership; that is, from 1938 to 1947.

Mr. CORTOR. Well, there were four that I know of in the electrical industry. And during this early part—1938 through the early 1940's—there were quite a few groups in different steel plants in St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. In your judgment, all in all, how many groups of the Communist Party were there in industrial plants?

Mr. CORTOR. It would be hard for me to say the exact number that there were.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names of the plants in which these industrial groups were organized, as far as you can recall at this time, including the union that organized the particular plant.

Mr. CORTOR. There was a group at Emerson Electric which was organized by the UE.

There was a group in Century Electric, also organized by the UE.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment, please.

What local of the UE organized Emerson Electric?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes. That was Local 1102. At Century Electric it was Local 1108 of the UE. And then there was a group in Wagner Electric, which was Local 1104. And a group in the Amalgamated local, which was Local 828 at the time, if I remember correctly.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Amalgamated local of the UE meant that that consisted of a local which had organized a number of smaller independent plants?

Mr. CORTOR. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have referred to a number of groups at that time in the steel plants. Can you elaborate on that?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, I knew of one group that was at the St. Louis Car Co. plant, which was organized by the Steel Workers' Organizing Committee. What the local number was there I couldn't say. And the various other steel plants, I couldn't identify the plants by name at the present time.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you refer to these groups of the Communist Party at Emerson Electric, Century Electric, and so on, are you referring to groups of the Communist Party which had been organized among the employees at those plants?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the Communist Party did they generally refer to those groups of the Communist Party by the name of the plant in which they were working?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said there were also fractions, that the organizational setup included fractions. What do you mean by that?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, you would have your different groups in the various plants, and each one of these groups would have 1 or 2 people selected to meet as a fraction for the industry as a whole.

Mr. TAVENNER. So that in industry, for instance, if you had a fraction meeting you had present representatives from these various organized groups of the Communist Party meeting in one meeting?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you place a reasonably accurate estimate on the Communist Party membership in St. Louis during that early period between 1938 and 1947?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, the first part of 1940 the party made the announcement that, if I remember the figure correctly, they gave it at 512 for the districtwide membership of the Communist Party at that time.

The district at that time was composed of Missouri and Arkansas.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give the committee any fair estimate as to the proportion of that membership which was located in the St. Louis area?

Mr. CORTOR. Oh, I would say 90 percent.

Mr. TAVENNER. After you returned to the Communist Party in 1951 you found that there had been quite a change, did you not, in the organization of the groups? That for security reasons the groups consisted of much smaller numbers.

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever in a position after 1951 to make any substantial estimate of the membership, any substantially correct estimate?

Mr. CORTOR. No, I wasn't.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Counsel, do you not think you should ask him to explain in reply to your question in which you asked whether the groups were much smaller in 1951 because of security reasons? Could he elaborate on that?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I think it would be well to explain it at this point, although I had expected to go into that later.

Mr. SCHERER. I will withdraw the request.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe now is the best time to do it since we have mentioned the matter.

What security provisions did the Communist Party have at the time you again became a member of it in 1951?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, the group memberships were, in the vast majority of cases, limited to not over 4 in any 1 group. And there would be only one person in that group who would be in contact with the next higher body, which would be the section. And then the section leaders, people in the section—there would be one person in that group who would be in contact with the next higher body, and so on up.

Mr. SCHERER. What was the reason for that, Witness?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, they were afraid of being exposed.

Mr. TAVENNER. The trial of the first Smith Act case was begun in 1949 and the committee has abundant evidence indicating that the plan which you say was in effect here in St. Louis was put into effect generally over the country in 1950.

Mr. SCHERER. For the purpose of preventing exposure.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, and for the purpose of concealing activities.

Going back to the organizational setup of the Communist Party, what was the next higher level of the Communist Party above that of neighborhood groups?

Mr. CORTOR. The city committee—do you mean in the early period?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. CORTOR. It would be the city committee, and then the State committee, and then the national body.

Mr. TAVENNER. You said there was a chain of organization from the lowest level of the neighborhood groups straight to the national body in New York City?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes. And at that time also the International body, the Communist International.

Mr. TAVENNER. To the Communist International.

When you first became a member of the Communist Party in 1938 were you assigned to any particular group of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes. I was assigned to the Emerson group. I was an employee of Emerson at that time, and I was assigned to work and maintain my party membership in that group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the chairman or leader of the Emerson group?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, the group was led by both William Sentner and Robert Manewitz. William Sentner also met with all the other groups and with the local head of the union at that period.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain a member of the Emerson group?

Mr. CORTOR. Oh, it was up until the latter part of 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where were the meetings held?

Mr. CORTOR. There were several held at the Vanguard Book Shop, 1 or 2 held at the party office at Vandeventer and Olive, and in various homes would be meetings of the group.

Mr. TAVENNER. At that period of time, what was the general course that the meetings took?

Mr. CORTOR. Just about 90 percent of the discussion would be involved around the problems in the local unions, and recruiting of further members from the local unions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee what the principal purpose of the Communist Party was in organizing these various groups in industry at that time?

Mr. CORTOR. To either maintain themselves in control or to obtain control of the local trade-union apparatus, and to further the program of the Communist Party in those trade unions.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think I will ask you at this time a question regarding certain decisions made by the Communist Party which were made about the time that you left the Communist Party in 1947.

I desire to read into the record at this point, as a basis for further questioning of this witness, "Schoemehl Exhibit No. 1."

Mr. MOULDER. Has that exhibit been admitted in evidence?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, it was first introduced in the executive testimony of Mr. Schoemehl.

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. This is a copy of a report by Ray Koch, organizational secretary of the Communist Party, under date of April 14, 1947, which the staff, in the course of its investigation, procured. This exhibit reads as follows:

#### ORGANIZATION DEPARTMENT REPORT TO CLUBS, APRIL 14, 1947

Following consultation with the national organization commission of our party, the Missouri State board has made a number of important decisions. These decisions are for the purpose of strengthening our party and its leadership in order that our party can fulfill its role in organizing and leading the struggles of our class and our people in Missouri. These decisions on Organization include:

1. That the Missouri district implement immediately and seriously its concentration policy in the electrical and machine industry, by establishing a concentration section plus the assignment of one fulltime person to head the concentration work.

2. That Ray Koch be assigned as organization secretary of the district full time, and that Al Murphy be assigned to full-time work as North Side section organizer and to raise the level of party activity among the Negro masses.

3. That, following the establishment of a concentration section, the remaining West Side clubs be consolidated with the North Side section, except that the Haldane (student) Club shall be assigned to the Professional section.

4. Organizational assignments involving the promotion of a number of comrades are being made for the following posts: (a) Educational director, (b) literature director, (c) press director, (d) finance and dues secretaries. The heads of these departments, together with the organizational secretary shall constitute the organizational department, to assist the sections and clubs in the proper organization and execution of their work.

5. A capable comrade is being assigned as trade union director to assist with the board in the coordination of the trade-union work of the party.

6. Additional commissions being established to assist in the development and guidance of party work are: (a) Youth commission, (b) Negro commission, (c) Review commission, (d) Out-State committee.

The above organizational decisions will aid in the development of collective leadership, division of work, and a greater all-around organizational efficiency.

RAY KOCH,  
*Organization Secretary.*

When you returned to the Communist Party in 1951, and up until 1954, was the Communist Party continuing this program of concentration in the electrical and machine industry?

Mr. CORTOR. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the course of your Communist Party activity did you become acquainted with Al Murphy?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he engage in the work indicated that he had been assigned to by this report?

Mr. CORTOR. He had engaged in that work for several years before then, to my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. Reference was made to the Out-State committee. What is meant by Out-State committee?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, I am not familiar with that letter due to the fact that I was a merchant seaman at that time and was at sea at the time that letter came out. But, in my judgment, it would be a committee to coordinate the work of the party people who lived outside of the St. Louis area.

Mr. TAVENNER. And in the district generally?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is meant by review commission?

Mr. CORTOR. That would be a commission they would set up to review the activities of the party, different sections of the party for a previous period.

Mr. SCHERER. Did the review commission have disciplinary power over the members of the party?

Mr. CORTOR. As to that I couldn't say.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you get an answer to the question?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes; he said he couldn't answer my question; he didn't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that in the executive testimony of Mr. Joseph John Schoemehl—

Mr. SCHERER. That was the reason I was asking the question, because I listened to his testimony, and did he not say that the review commission did have disciplinary powers?

And wasn't he called before the review commission and tried?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir; that is correct.



In addition to other things, it acted and served as a control or disciplinary committee.

Mr. SCHERER. And further that a member was not allowed to invoke the fifth amendment before that commission.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you given any particular assignment in the Communist Party during the period of time that you were a member of the Emerson electrical group of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, there was one assignment while I was in that group outside of my maintaining membership and furthering the work of the party in the local union. I was assigned to work with the unemployed due to the fact that for a considerable period of time, when I met with the electrical fraction, I was unemployed, and obtained a job on WPA for the purpose of helping lead the unemployed group here in St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was this group in the unemployed utilized to increase the membership of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. They used this group as a recruiting basis; yes. I personally didn't recruit anybody out of the group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now you have described for us the fraction meetings in the industrial units. Did you attend any fraction meetings yourself?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes, I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a representative of your electrical group in those fraction meetings?

Mr. CORTOR. I could not say that I was official representative, but I would be invited to attend some of the fraction meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. How frequently did you attend these fraction meetings?

Mr. CORTOR. Oh, I would say I attended 4 or 5 of them during the time I was assigned to the Emerson group.

Mr. TAVENNER. And, as you have said, the persons who attended these fraction meetings represented various organized groups of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. In industry?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. And therefore when you can identify an individual from a particular company or employment—that meant that there was a Communist Party group organized within that plant?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, not necessarily. See you take in the Amalgamated local—they may have only one member in a plant, but they would have a group in the local.

Mr. TAVENNER. But, other than the Amalgamated group, it would mean the Communist Party organized group?

Mr. CORTOR. That is true, yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you at this time tell the committee who met with you in these fraction meetings, and give the committee all the descriptive information you can regarding the individual.

Mr. CORTOR. Well, there was William Sentner who maintained his local membership in Local 1102, the Emerson local.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he one of those convicted in the Smith Act trial in 1954?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes; that is right; and Robert Manewitz also from Local 1102, who was also a defendant.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well.

Mr. CORTOR. Henry Fiering, who was at Century Electric at that time; Otto Maschoff.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was that name?

Mr. CORTOR. Otto Maschoff.

Mr. TAVENNER. M-a-s-c-h-o-f-f. Is that the correct spelling?

Mr. CORTOR. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. From what plant?

Mr. CORTOR. Century Electric.

And Helen Musiel, who led the strike at the Superior Electric Co.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell the committee at this point anything more about Helen Musiel?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes; later, in a later period, Helen Musiel became a full-time functionary of the Communist Party here in St. Louis for, oh, quite a few years. The exact length of time she was a full-time functionary I couldn't say because I was gone so much of the time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you proceed, please.

Mr. CORTOR. There was Dave Barker from Wagner Electric. Zollie Carpenter also from Wagner Electric.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the first name.

Mr. CORTOR. Z-o-l-l-i-e; and Orville Leach.

Mr. TAVENNER. Orville Leach? L-e-a-c-h?

Mr. CORTOR. L-e-a-c-h, who was originally out of the Amalgamated local, and then later on went to work at Wagner.

Lou Kimmel, also from Emerson Electric, also attended some of these fraction meetings.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who?

Mr. CORTOR. Lou Kimmel, Louis Kimmel.

Mr. TAVENNER. All right. Do you know what position Lou Kimmel later acquired in the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America?

Mr. CORTOR. He was either a field or an International representative of the UE.

And Henry Fiering was also in the meetings, if I have not named him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall the names of others at this time?

Mr. CORTOR. Who attended the electrical fraction meetings?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

(There was no response.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with John Nordman?

Mr. CORTOR. Oh, yes. John Nordman was also from Century Electric.

Mr. TAVENNER. N-o-r-d-m-a-n?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he attend these fraction meetings?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall anyone from Johnston Tinfoil?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes, there was a James Payne.

Mr. TAVENNER. P-a-y-n-e?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall any other person from Emerson?

Mr. CORTOR. At the present time, no.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was there a woman in the group from Emerson?

Mr. CORTOR. Not at that time, not during this period, no.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Dorothy Sage?

Mr. CORTOR. I was acquainted with Dorothy Sage, but she went to work at Emerson Electric after I had left the electrical union. I knew her during the early period. She was active in the Young Communist League under her maiden name, Dorothy Aukamp, A-u-k-a-m-p.

Mr. TAVENNER. She was not, as far as you can recall, a member of this fraction?

Mr. CORTOR. Not at that period.

Mr. TAVENNER. These fraction meetings to which you have referred were fraction meetings of the Communist Party, were they not?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were they open to the public or were only members of the Communist Party permitted to attend?

Mr. CORTOR. Only members of the Communist Party were permitted to attend. Other people might be invited in occasionally, but very seldom.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were all of the persons whose names you have mentioned as having attended these fraction meetings known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. They were.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any schools of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes, sir, I attended several of the schools, local schools conducted by the Communist Party. One specifically was held at 3528-A Franklin Avenue, which was a night school I attended after work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Approximately what year?

Mr. CORTOR. That was in the fall of 1939, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell us who conducted that school, the instructors, or the leaders in it?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, there was one individual that was sent out by the National educational committee of the Communist Party, by the name of Peter Chaunt; C-h-a-u-n-t I believe is the way he spelled it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Sent from where?

Mr. CORTOR. From the National educational committee of the Communist Party, in New York.

And Carolyn Drew.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Carolyn Drew the wife of William Sentner?

Mr. CORTOR. No. Of Alfred Wagenknecht.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are there any others you can recall?

Mr. CORTOR. And Clara Wernick also led one of the sessions. She was the wife of Henry Fiering.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the general type of teaching conducted at that school?

Mr. CORTOR. It was a basic course in Marxism-Leninism for what they termed "newer people in the party." And it went deeply into the whole setup in explaining to the people there that the only way that the working class, which the Communist Party claimed to represent, could obtain power would be through force and violence, that the so-called capitalists or the bourgeoisie would not let the working class take power without force and violence.

Mr. SCHERER. That was actually taught at this school?

Mr. CORTOR. That was actually taught; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. You remained a member of the Communist Party, you said, from 1938 up until 1947. Was there any time during that period when your Communist Party activities were transferred to any other area of the country?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, yes. For quite a long period of time I was assigned to the Waterfront section of the Communist Party, and also for almost a year I worked up in the District 7 area of the UE as a field representative.

Mr. TAVENNER. Of the UE?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Before I question you about that, let me ask you when were you transferred to the Waterfront section.

Mr. CORTOR. It was in the fall of 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. After being transferred to that section, did you still remain in contact with the Emerson group of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes. I attended a few of their meetings after the transfer to the Waterfront section.

Mr. TAVENNER. Under what jurisdiction was the Waterfront section of the Communist Party? Was it a part of your district here or how was it organized?

Mr. CORTOR. The Waterfront section of the party was set up as a National section of the party.

Due to the industry and the way the men engaged in the waterfront industry move around the country, they were actually set up as, well, what they actually term "as a separate district of the party."

The people that were assigned to the waterfront continued in the local party, but they actually weren't under the jurisdiction of the local party leadership.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that because you would first be in one port and then another?

Mr. CORTOR. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you could not be tied down to any particular group?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what areas of the country did you attend Communist Party meetings?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, while I was in the Waterfront section I attended meetings in St. Louis, in New Orleans, Galveston, Tex., and one meeting in Houston.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you were a member of the Waterfront section did you go abroad at any time?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any contact with Communists in foreign ports?

Mr. CORTOR. In Marseilles, France, and in Genoa, Italy. I visited the party headquarters in Marseilles, and helped them celebrate an election victory over there. And I visited the party offices in Genoa, and one of their branch offices there, and made a tour through the shipyards there under the leadership of the branch organizer of the party there.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean the branch organizer of the Communist Party took you through the shipyard?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you learn anything about the strength of the Communist Party in the shipping industry over there; that is, the shipyards?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, this organizer told me that 70 percent of the workers at this shipyard were members of the Communist Party.

Mr. MOULDER. Which shipyard was that?

Mr. CORTOR. I don't remember the name of it. It was a repair yard there in Genoa, Italy. It was a repair yard that did mostly repair work and did very little original building.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the principal activity of the Waterfront section of the Communist Party with which you were affiliated?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, mostly operating to control the National Maritime Union at that period.

Mr. TAVENNER. The National Maritime Union succeeded in getting rid of the Communists at a later date, did they not?

Mr. CORTOR. They did a very good job of doing it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever observe any effort on the part of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers to get rid of communism within that organization?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, some of the locals made quite an effort. Local 1102 here in St. Louis, and the Century local made quite an effort. But, due to the fact that the top leadership of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers were Communist, the local membership was more or less stymied.

Mr. SCHERER. In other words, they did not succeed in their efforts to rid the local union from Communist domination because of the control of the National organization by Communists?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, they succeeded in some cases, but, overall, they were unable to clean house due to the domination of the National officers of the UE.

Mr. SCHERER. That condition continued until you left the party in 1954, did it? That situation with reference to the UE continued up until the date when you left the party in 1954?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, at the time I left the party in 1954 there was practically no UE left in St. Louis. I mean they had a few. The Amalgamated local was still in existence. But the UE was practically a dead pigeon at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to the time that the National Maritime Union was successful in ousting communism from its organization to what extent would you say the maritime union at St. Louis was under the control and domination of the Communist element?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, from the time when I first went into the Waterfront section up until 1948 the River section of the National Maritime Union was under the complete domination and control of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many persons comprised the membership of the Communist Party in the River section of the maritime union at that time; at the time they had control?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, to the best of my knowledge, I think their top strength in any one year was 11.

Mr. TAVENNER. Eleven.

Do you mean that 11 persons could exercise and keep control of that union?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, yes; through the assistance they received from the National union.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the membership of the union at that time which you say was dominated here in St. Louis by the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. I would say, over all, on the water approximately 2,000.

Mr. TAVENNER. So that 2,000 persons were dominated or at least led by 11 Communist individuals?

Mr. CORTOR. Right.

Mr. SCHERER. Were they the officers of the union?

Mr. CORTOR. In most cases, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think, Mr. Chairman, it might be well to remind the subcommittee at this point, because all of you were not in Los Angeles in April, that we had as a witness, Nikolai Khokhlov, who, until 1953, had been a captain in the military intelligence in the Soviet Union. And he testified that in the Soviet Union at the present time the Communist Party consists of only 2 per cent of the people, and yet they were able to control the entire country.

And also, as pointed out by this witness, the number of people in concentration camps in the country who were opposed to communism were 13 million, which was about 6 times as many persons as there were Communists in the country, the whole country.

Mr. MOULDER. Yes; I recall his testimony.

Mr. SCHERER. Was he not there as late as 1954 rather than 1953, Mr. TAVENNER?

Mr. TAVENNER. That is not my recollection, Mr. Scherer.

He had been sent in 1953 on a mission to organize the assassination of the leader of the anti-Communists.

Mr. SCHERER. In Frankfurt.

Mr. TAVENNER. The underground in West Germany.

He may not have gotten to this country until 1954, but I think that he left the Soviet Union in 1953, according to my recollection.

Will you tell us, please, the names of those who were the principal leaders in the Communist Party movement within the maritime union while you were a member of it?

Mr. CORTOR. When I first entered the Waterfront section it was A. E. Phillips who was the local agent at that time. Felix Siren who was the River's director.

And the national figures were Howard McKenzie and Frederick Myers, who were both vice presidents. And Ferdinand C. Smith, who was national secretary.

Mr. TAVENNER. Ferdinand C. Smith was deported, was he not?

Mr. CORTOR. To the best of my knowledge, he was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, this is the same individual about whom the committee received evidence from Patrick Walsh, the Canadian seaman, in our hearings in Albany, N. Y. Mr. Walsh testified that had it not been for the deportation proceedings against Ferdinand Smith and the action of the National Maritime Union in getting rid of Ferdinand Smith, that the maritime union on the Eastern Seaboard would have been successfully brought into the Canadian seamen's strike at the time that the whole world shipping was blocked by a Communist strike. That was in 1948 or 1949.

But for the resistance of the leadership of this maritime union to the Communist plan, which Patrick Walsh described in his testimony, it may well have been a worldwide strike which would have succeeded in upsetting the Marshall Plan. That was the testimony that was given, that was what the strike was aimed at.

Do you recall the names of any other persons who were active in the maritime-union group of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. In a later period there was Mrs. Pearl Bernstein Starks.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it Stark or Starks?

Mr. CORTOR. Starks.

Mr. TAVENNER. S-t-a-r-k-s?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

She wasn't married to Mr. Starks at the time she was in the NMU office here. She was the office secretary, and more or less served as the party contact for us people who would be out of town and wanted to drop in and find out what was happening in the local party.

And William E. Davis, who was a patrolman in Memphis in this later period.

Mr. TAVENNER. After you returned to the Communist Party in 1951 did you have occasion to see William E. Davis again in the St. Louis area?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did he continue in Communist Party activities during the period between 1951 and 1954?

Mr. CORTOR. He did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then, as I understand it, you were in the maritime union from 1939 until 1947. Was there any intervening period in which you became active in Communist Party work in some other area?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes. I served for almost a year in District 7 of the UE, which is the Ohio area.

Mr. TAVENNER. District 7?

Mr. CORTOR. Of the UE, as a field representative.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, how you obtained the position of organizer of the UE in Ohio.

Mr. CORTOR. Well, I was on a river boat that had pulled into Cincinnati for some repairs.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you say Cincinnati?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

We pulled in there and were going to have a few days there. So I was pulled in one evening looking over Cincinnati, and I saw the local sign. I forget the local number, the local of the UE. And I had heard that Henry Fiering was in Ohio somewhere. So I went into this local headquarters.

Mr. SCHERER. What year was that?

Mr. CORTOR. 1945.

I met a person by the name of Waldo Stager, who was a local leader, and I asked him about Henry Fiering, and told him that I had been a friend of Mr. Fiering's in St. Louis and wondered where Mr. Fiering was. And he told me that Mr. Fiering would be in that local office that night, for me to drop back if I wanted to see Mr. Fiering, which I proceeded to do.

And Mr. Fiering introduced me to Mr. Stager then as a member of the party, and a person he considered one of his prize recruits.

And that evening Mr. Fiering asked me if I would be interested in a job with the UE in Ohio.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you took the job?

Mr. CORTOR. I took the job.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long were you on that job?

Mr. CORTOR. It was from the latter part of January up through December of 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you find that the leadership in the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers in District 7 in Ohio was Communist leadership?

Mr. CORTOR. 95 percent of them were, the full-time people that I met.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what area of Ohio did you work?

Mr. CORTOR. I first worked in the Cincinnati area for about 6 weeks under the direction of Mr. Stager; as Mr. Fiering termed it, to be my break-in period, to observe operations in the local unions and attend negotiating sessions with the different companies. And then I was transferred up to the Dayton area.

Mr. TAVENNER. To Dayton?

Mr. CORTOR. The Dayton, Ohio area, to work out of the subdistrict office up there under the direction of Mr. Fiering.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time what were your opportunities while in Dayton to learn of the Communist Party membership of leaders in the UE?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, I attended several staff meetings, and I would come into Dayton occasionally to run off organizational leaflets for various plants that I was trying to organize. And I would meet various party people in the UE office at that time. And also I attended—I couldn't say exactly how many meetings I did attend, but of the electrical fraction of the Communist Party—

Mr. TAVENNER. The electrical fraction of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Before we leave the Cincinnati area, can you give us the names of any other individuals you met while in Cincinnati who were members of the Communist Party other than this man Stager?

Mr. CORTOR. No, sir, I cannot. The fellow's name is Stager, S-t-a-g-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. S-t-a-g-e-r?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Where was their headquarters at that time?

Mr. CORTOR. I don't know. This was the local union—

It was out rather far in Cincinnati. I don't remember just exactly the address. It was the Amalgamated Local of Machine Shops.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you learn where the Communist Party headquarters were located in Cincinnati?

Mr. CORTOR. No. I was never in the party headquarters in Cincinnati.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names of persons with whom you attended Communist fraction meetings in Dayton?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

It was Henry Fiering, Senator Kermit Kirkendall who was a State senator in Ohio at that time—



Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Scherer, I believe, you were chairman of the subcommittee that met in Dayton in September in 1954, and, will recall there was some evidence at that time on that same subject.

Mr. SCHERER. Yes. The man Kirkendall and the other man to whom he referred were identified by a number of witnesses at that time as active members of the Communist Party.

So, in that respect, this witness' testimony is corroborated. They all participated in that Univis Lens strike, did they not, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. In the Dayton strike, which was completely controlled and dominated by the Communist Party, it was necessary to call out the National Guard because of the severe violence that developed in connection therewith.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

All right, if you will proceed, please, sir.

Mr. CORTOR. There was a girl named Bebe Ober. And Forrest Payne.

Mr. SCHERER. I might say I distinctly recollect that Bebe Ober testified before the committee at that time. She had been identified as a member of the Communist Party. I think Bebe Ober left the party, however, did she not, and testified for the Government?

Mr. TAVENNER. That is correct. She admitted her former Communist Party membership and was helpful in the testimony she gave us.

Mr. SCHERER. Wasn't she one of those that was recruited into the Communist Party while a student at Antioch College, Yellow Springs?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. She began with it as a member in the Young Communist League. And Herbert Reed, the Communist Party organizer in the area, followed those young people up after leaving Antioch College, and got some of them, including this person that you have identified, Bebe Ober, to get into active Communist Party work in the field of labor.

Mr. SCHERER. After she graduated from Antioch.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, that is correct.

Are there any others you can now recall?

Mr. CORTOR. Have I mentioned Forrest Payne?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Can you give the committee more information relating to Forrest Payne?

Mr. CORTOR. Forrest I knew and worked with him in the one plant that was my assignment to try to organize, which was the Robins & Myers Electric Co. in Springfield, Ohio. Mr. Payne gave me some assistance on that plant, and one evening drove me down to Yellow Springs. He said there was some people down there he wanted me to meet.

And we went to some professor's house, but I haven't been able to recollect the name of this professor.

Mr. SCHERER. I wish you could.

Mr. CORTOR. I do, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. What year was that?

Mr. CORTOR. That was in 1945.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you remember at what school he was a professor?

Mr. CORTOR. I don't have the slightest recollection. I was at Antioch College.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Tavenner, do you recall the name of one of the professors who testified about that time? He said he was a member of a Communist cell comprised not only of people of the college but also of townspeople. What was that professor's name?

Mr. TAVENNER. Professor Robert M. Metcalf.

Mr. SCHERER. He refused to tell who was associated with him in that cell; did he not?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. And was cited for contempt.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is correct.

Mr. SCHERER. And contempt proceedings are still pending.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you learn of any Communist Party activities within Vernay Laboratories in Yellow Springs?

Mr. CORTOR. No; I did not.

Mr. SCHERER. Let me ask a question.

Does the mention of Professor Metcalf refresh your recollection?

Mr. CORTOR. No; it doesn't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what influence the Communist Party had in the conduct of the business of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers in the Ohio area during the period that you were there?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, they had a tremendous influence because 95 per cent of the full-time people in Ohio were members of the Communist Party or very close sympathizers.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were the plants organized by United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers in that area, plants which were engaged in the manufacture of defense materials for the United States Government?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes, very definitely.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the Communist Party leadership and influence of sufficient strength to have altered the conduct or operation of those defense plants?

Mr. CORTOR. In the Dayton, Ohio, area I would say definitely, yes.

Mr. SCHERER. I think his testimony has been corroborated again by the testimony at Dayton in that respect. I refer to the Univis strike.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now were there others? I may have interrupted you. Were there other persons you can now recall in leadership in the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party in that area?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes, on the districtwide level, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us their names, please?

Mr. CORTOR. There was Victor Decavitch, who was district president at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment.

Mr. Chairman, Victor Decavitch was one of the first witnesses that this committee heard in our investigation of communism within the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers Union. He testified in the summer or fall of 1949. He told this committee of his former Communist Party membership and activity, and that he was no longer a member of the Communist Party. And he cooperated with this committee and gave it some important information, including his statement that, in his opinion, 99 per cent of the organizers in

the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America were members of the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHERER. That testimony was confirmed by a number of other witnesses subsequent to that.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is those with whom he came in contact.

Mr. CORTOR. There was Marie Haug.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us that name again.

Mr. CORTOR. Haug.

Mr. TAVENNER. H-a-u-g?

Mr. CORTOR. I believe that is the way it is spelled.

And her husband, who was in Cleveland at that time.

And Clara Wernick Fiering.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was Marie Haug's husband's name?

Mr. CORTOR. Fred, I believe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then did you name another person?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes. Clara Wernick Fiering, who at that time was business agent at the UE lamp local in Cleveland. I don't know the local number. But she identified herself to me in Dayton to that effect.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why did you leave your work as an organizer of UE?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, due to the fact that the Robins & Myers plant—I was forced to go into an election over my objection. Mr. Fiering—

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by an election?

Mr. CORTOR. The election in the plant for bargaining rights for the UE. It was right during the General Motors strike in the fall and early winter in 1945, and I was the person most closely connected to the plant, and I knew the sentiment of the people. They were discouraged due to the length of the General Motors strike. And I told Mr. Fiering if we went into an election during that period we would be sure to lose it.

He said, "No, we would win it."

And I said, "Well, if we lose it I quit."

Because I said, "You are going into it over my objection."

And we went into the election and we lost by exactly the number of votes I told him we would lose by.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many votes?

Mr. CORTOR. Sixty-four.

Mr. TAVENNER. Out of a total number of how many votes?

Mr. CORTOR. It was around one-thousand-four-hundred-some-odd votes cast.

Mr. TAVENNER. A fairly close election. As a result of that did you resign?

Mr. CORTOR. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. And you came back—

Mr. CORTOR. Back to maritime.

Mr. TAVENNER. Back to maritime. And you remained in the maritime union then how long?

Mr. CORTOR. I stayed in the maritime union until 1950, the fall of 1950. But I severed my connections with the party in 1947.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why did you sever your connections with the Communist Party in 1947?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, the thought had been in my mind. I had had doubts in my mind for several years, including the experience I had

in this plant of Robins & Myers in Ohio. And the doubts had been in my mind for several years until I was elected a delegate to attend the 1947 national convention, the National Maritime Union.

In all my previous experience in the party this was the first real opportunity I had ever had of seeing the real Communist Party machine in operation with their rule-and-ruin tactics, because at that time the party was engaged in a very bitter fight with the current faction of the National Maritime Union. And the policy they adopted was it would be rule or ruin, regardless of the effects it might have on the membership of the union, that the party must stay in power.

So after the convention I told the party people that I was in contact with, that I had no further intention of remaining in the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did any specific occurrence take place at that convention which influenced you in your decision?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, the whole tenor of the whole convention.

But there was one specific instance. I can't remember the name of the individual, but he was appealing his conviction by a trial committee.

The way the setup they have in the NMU is: if a person violates the rules and regulations of the union, like if he is on the crew of a ship and cuts a fellow with a knife or he is a dope fiend or anything like that, the crew will bring him up on charges. And he is tried in the port where they dock.

The membership of that port elects a trial committee, and they try the person. And they fine him or sentence him to so long a suspension and so forth. And he can accept the ruling of the trial committee or can appeal to the national council. If the national council rejects his appeal he can appeal to the national convention.

Well, this fellow had exhausted all these other steps, and had appealed to the previous national convention which had rejected him. And here he was appealing to the 1947 convention.

So we had a copy of the proceedings at the 1945 convention on our desk, a book about so thick. So I get to leafing through it and I find the proceedings of this person's appearance before the trial committee in the 1945 convention. And they were arguing back and forth. First there would be a Communist get up and speak for this guy, and there would be somebody else get up and speak about it.

So I raised my hand, with the book in my hand. And the president of the union, Joe Kern, gave me the microphone, and I read from the 1945 proceedings, the position the convention took at that time. And the final vote was to uphold the action of the previous convention.

I was called up on the carpet by some of the party people there.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were?

Mr. CORTOR. And the man had been convicted in court of being a dope fiend.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you learn whether or not that individual was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. I was told he was a good guy. As to whether he was actually a member of the Communist Party I couldn't say.

Mr. TAVENNER. A good guy?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; we have heard that a number of times.

Mr. Chairman, this would be a good place for a break.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will stand in recess for a period of 5 minutes.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken, there being present at the time of taking the recess Representatives Moulder, Frazier, and Scherer.)

(The committee was reconvened upon the expiration of the recess, there being present Representatives Moulder, Frazier, and Scherer.)

Mr. MOULDER. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Cortor, as a result of your experience in the Communist Party, did you take any action to advise your Government of facts within your knowledge about their activities?

Mr. CORTOR. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell the committee what you did, please.

Mr. CORTOR. Well, after I left the party in 1947, until the first trial in New York I was more at a loss as to what I could do with what little information I had.

After the first trial in New York I decided what little information I knew about the Communist Party might be of value. So I contacted the Federal Bureau of Investigation here in St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. What year was it you contacted the FBI here in St. Louis?

Mr. CORTOR. In 1950.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a result of that, what occurred?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, after several conferences with the Federal Bureau of Investigation they asked me if I would go back into the party, if I thought I could get back.

I told them I would not go back under my own hook, of my own volition. But if the Communist Party came to me, then I would go back into activities in the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did they come to you?

Mr. CORTOR. They did.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell the committee how that occurred.

Mr. CORTOR. I was contacted by a woman by the name of Thelma Hecht, who told me that Robert Manewitz would like to see me. And I agreed to see Mr. Manewitz.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say this was Thelma Hecht?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell the name? H-e-c-h-t?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then what occurred?

Mr. CORTOR. I had one meeting with Mr. Manewitz. We went over the whole problem. I was very frank with him. I gave him exactly the reasons why I left the party.

And, after some discussion, he still asked me to "reactivate" myself, as he termed it. And I still refused to do so.

So he asked me to have another meeting with him later, and I agreed to that. And at that second meeting with Mr. Manewitz I did agree to reactivate myself in the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHERER. How long was it after you had this discussion with the Federal Bureau of Investigation wherein they asked you to rejoin the Communist Party that you were contacted by the party?

Mr. CORTOR. It was about 6 months.

Mr. SCHERER. You told the FBI that you would not rejoin the Communist Party unless you were requested to rejoin?

Mr. CORTOR. Unless I was contacted by the party itself.

Mr. SCHERER. I don't know how that happened, but I imagine they had some other undercover agent ask Manewitz to get you back in the party.

Mr. CORTOR. Well, no, sir.

You see the policy of the Communist Party—

You never quit the Communist Party. You may drop out, but you become inactive. They always have an idea that they can eventually reactivate you, they call it, which was the procedure I went under. I was reactivated, as Robert Manewitz termed it.

Mr. SCHERER. You had been out since 1948?

Mr. CORTOR. 1947.

Mr. SCHERER. And they did not try to contact you until 6 months after the FBI talked to you in 1950?

Mr. CORTOR. No.

I was contacted several times in that period, but I just told the people, you know—if I would meet them on the street, wherever I would meet them—I just wasn't interested.

Mr. MOULDER. When you say you are never completely out of the Communist Party, do you mean that is the attitude which the leadership takes toward a former member?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Mr. MOULDER. But that may not be the attitude of the former member himself.

Mr. CORTOR. No. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. To what group of the Communist Party were you assigned when you reentered in 1951?

Mr. CORTOR. I was assigned to one of the West Side groups.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the chairman of that group?

Mr. CORTOR. Thelma Hecht.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with the husband of Thelma Hecht?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was his name?

Mr. CORTOR. Julius.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. Thelma so identified him to me. He had been a member of the party in my previous membership, and Thelma identified him to me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Don't state what someone told you about it. Just state what you yourself know.

Mr. CORTOR. I knew him as a member of the Communist Party during both periods; in the first period especially.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give us the names of other members of that group, the West Side group.

Mr. CORTOR. All right, sir.

There was John Nordman.

Mr. TAVENNER. N-o-r-d-m-a-n?

Mr. CORTOR. That is correct.

Orville Leach, L-e-a-c-h, Robert Manewitz, and myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. So that made five?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I think you told us that the membership after 1951 was to be about four.

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

The question was brought up in the group whether or not I was a fifth member of the group, which made one too many, and one person would have to leave the group. And Mr. Manewitz did leave. I mean what other group he was assigned to I couldn't say, but he was taken out of this group.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you given any particular assignment in the Communist Party after reentering it in 1951?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, in the later period I was—

After the arrest of the Smith Act defendants I was asked to work with a group that was set up, that was called the St. Louis Emergency Defense Committee, and to work in a group established here, the local branch in the National Negro Labor Council.

Mr. TAVENNER. What did you learn in the Communist Party meetings regarding this defense committee?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, I was informed when it was first set up in our branch meeting it was a group set up to—

There was a group set up, in the first place, to get the five defendants out of jail, to raise bail money, conduct their legal defense and get them out of jail, and also to collect money for their defense when they came up to trial. And they would also serve as a propaganda apparatus before the public to diffuse the party program and so on and so forth under the guise of the defense committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that was a Communist-organized group?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. And in what capacity did you work with the group?

Mr. CORTOR. I helped them in operating the mimeograph machine, getting out mailings, and in furnishing transportation to the chairman of the group—that is by the use of my auto, and any other way that I could be fit into the picture.

Mr. TAVENNER. The St. Louis Emergency Defense Committee was the exact name of it, was it not?

Mr. CORTOR. That is correct, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. No, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. It was not?

Mr. CORTOR. It was a Communist Party apparatus, but it was not set up as a part of the Communist Party. It was a front group for the Communist Party.

Mr. MOULDER. Now I understand you. It was an agency of the Communist Party actually.

Mr. CORTOR. Actually, yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the names of those active in that group who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party.

Mr. CORTOR. Mr. Brockman Schumacher who was the chairman of the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. The first name, you say, is Brockman?

Mr. CORTOR. Brockman.

Mr. TAVENNER. How do you spell that?

Mr. CORTOR. B-r-o-c-k-m-a-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. S-c-h-u-m-a-c-h-e-r?

Mr. CORTOR. I believe that is the way the last name is spelled.

Mr. TAVENNER. He was the head of the committee?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. What other persons were active in the conduct of its business who were known to you to be members of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. There was William E. Davis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that the same William E. Davis you referred to as having been in the maritime union with you?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

James Wilburn.

Mr. TAVENNER. Wilburn?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. W-i-l-b-u-r-n?

Mr. CORTOR. I believe so.

Romey Hudson.

Mr. TAVENNER. R-o-m-e-y?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Hudson, H-u-d-s-o-n. Is that the spelling?

Mr. CORTOR. I believe so.

And there would be various other party people that would drop in from time to time in case we had an emergency mailing or anything of that kind to get out.

But these were the people that were predominant in what you call the directing force of the St. Louis Emergency Defense Committee.

Mr. SCHERER. They were the directing force. How many other persons who were non-Communists joined this defense committee?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, I couldn't say actually how many non-Communists there were. There were some people there that could have been Communists, or they couldn't. I couldn't swear as to whether they were Communists or not.

Mr. SCHERER. Were there some others who were not Communists, but who sympathized?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes, a few.

Mr. SCHERER. You obtained some of your money from non-Communists, did you not?

Mr. CORTOR. That is true.

Mr. SCHERER. But the committee by itself, as you point out, was set up, controlled, and dominated by Communists. It was not a Communist organization as such.

You mean anyone who was not a Communist could be a member of the committee?

Mr. CORTOR. That is true.

Mr. SCHERER. The idea was to get people who were not Communists to be members of the committee. Was that not the object?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. That is the reason you called it a Communist-front organization, because it was not solely composed of Communists?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you get much of your money for that defense committee from non-Communists?

Mr. CORTOR. I couldn't say. I wasn't in the financial end of it.



Mr. SCHERER. The purpose of the committee, of course, was to raise money, or rather one of the purposes of the committee was to raise money. Do you have any idea how much money you raised?

Mr. CORTOR. No, sir, I couldn't say.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall a person by the name of Sol Nissen, N-i-s-s-e-n?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes, I do.

As one person, they gave him a title one night as the manager of the mimeograph. He did a good proportion of the mimeograph work for the defense committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Sol Nissen known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes, sir.

In my contact with him while I was employed at the Fisher Body plant at General Motors I got to know Mr. Nissen as a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Back at that time?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Who handled the finances for that committee? Who was the head of the money-raising section of the committee?

Mr. CORTOR. The person that actually handled the money for the defense committee was Dr. Sol Londe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Sol Londe?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

The money was——

Other people would collect money and it would eventually be funneled to Dr. Londe.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had you had any other experience with Dr. Sol Londe before serving on this defense committee with him?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, yes. I first met Dr. Londe in 1938 when I went to him for a physical examination as a volunteer in the Abraham Lincoln Brigade to fight in Spain.

Mr. SCHERER. Is he a medical doctor?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes, he is a medical doctor.

Mr. TAVENNER. By whom were you sent to Dr. Londe?

Mr. CORTOR. I was referred to him by the party office. If I remember correctly, it was Carolyn Drew who sent me to him.

Mr. TAVENNER. At the Communist Party office?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you pay anything?

Mr. CORTOR. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. For your examination?

Mr. CORTOR. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether the Communist Party did or not?

Mr. CORTOR. I don't know, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did this group go about raising money?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, they eventually ended up with all the mailing list of all the front groups, and any other places where they could get anybody's mailing list.

There were some of the professional groups in St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Professional groups of what?

Mr. CORTOR. Any of the professional groups they could get in contact with they thought they might be able to get some money out of.

And then door-to-door canvassing in some places. A person would be given a list of names to go see if they could get money from.

Mr. SCHERER. Did the general public or people from whom you were soliciting these funds know that this committee was Communist controlled and Communist dominated, or did you suppress that information?

Mr. CORTOR. That information was suppressed.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a document which says The St. Louis Defender, issued by the St. Louis Emergency Defense Committee, May 26, 1956, which is a very vicious attack on this committee in the conduct of this hearing, and which goes to considerable length in encouraging witnesses not to testify and to use the fifth amendment in refusing to do so.

Will you examine it, please, and state whether or not that is the same organization of which you have been speaking—the St. Louis Emergency Defense Committee?

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. SCHERER. Is that still in existence today, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. This would indicate that on May 26, 1956, its name was used.

Mr. CORTOR. This is the same name, under the same name, yes. That, I would take to be the same organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to have the document marked for identification purposes only as "Cortor Exhibit No. 1."

The CHAIRMAN. It will be so marked and filed.

(The document referred to was marked Cortor Exhibit No. 1 for identification and retained in the files of the committee.)

Mr. SCHERER. We have not seen that yet.

Mr. TAVENNER. I don't know whether you have or not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SCHERER. How long have you had that?

Mr. TAVENNER. I think about 2 days.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Mr. Cortor, you have said that you were assigned to membership in one of the West Side groups, and that its chairman was Thelma Hecht.

Were you transferred from her group to another group?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of that group of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. It was called the Construction Workers Group.

Mr. TAVENNER. How many persons were members of that group?

Mr. CORTOR. There were four.

Mr. TAVENNER. Does that include yourself?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes; that includes myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were the other members of that group?

Mr. CORTOR. John Day.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had you had any other Communist Party connection with John Day besides your association with him in this particular group of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes. I knew Mr. Day during my early period in the Communist Party, and also knew him later as a member of an auto branch of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well. Proceed, please.

Mr. CORTOR. And there was a Frank Mariz who was a painter. He spells his name either M-a-r-i-z or M-a-r-i-t-z. I have seen him use both spellings at one time or another.

And Simon Tendle or Kendle. I am not sure of the correct last name.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of that group?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, that was a group of construction workers that were trying to penetrate the construction industry, trying to get some influence in the construction workers' unions here, which, in my opinion, they didn't succeed in doing.

Mr. Day at that time was a cement finisher. Mr. Mariz was a painter. And Mr. Tendle or Kendle was a bricklayer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Going back for a moment to the St. Louis defense committee, I am not certain I gave you an opportunity to give us the names of all of those you considered to be the leaders in that group. The last one that you gave was Hudson, Romey Hudson. Then I think I got off into a discussion and probably interrupted you.

Mr. CORTOR. Well, Mrs. Dorothy Forrest helped direct the group after she was gotten out of jail on bail.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dorothy Forrest?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes. She was one of the Smith Act defendants, and she was with the group.

And so did the rest of the Smith Act defendants. The actual leadership outside of these people I have named would be hard for me to remember at this time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Mr. Sol Derman?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he active in that group?

Mr. CORTOR. To some extent. He attended some of the meetings and was actually, I believe, on the steering committee of the defense committee. But he didn't attend too many meetings of the defense committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did the leadership come from in the Communist Party here while these principal defendants were being tried under the Smith Act?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, it came from what they call the secondary leadership of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Secondary leadership?

Mr. CORTOR. Or the section leaders of the Communist Party at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us their names, or as many of them as you recall.

Mr. CORTOR. Well, Thelma Hecht was one. And Harold Hall.

Mr. TAVENNER. Harold Hall?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us any further information relating to the activities of Harold Hall?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, I met Mr. Hall as a member of the Communist Party when I for a short period of time was transferred to one of the South Side groups of the Communist Party. And Mr. Hall attended several of their meetings as a section leader.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you proceed with the names of any other persons who constituted the secondary leadership of the Communist Party.

Mr. CORTOR. Well, those are the only two individuals that I could specifically identify.

Mr. TAVENNER. After a period of time in this construction group, were you transferred to another group of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes. I transferred to the South Side group that I previously spoke of, for a short period of time, a period of, oh a few months.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were in the South Side group with you?

Mr. CORTOR. There was Bruce and Laura Miller, man and wife.

Mr. TAVENNER. Bruce Miller and Laura Miller.

Had you had any previous experience with them in the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes. In the early period I belonged—They were both members of the Communist Party at that time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you then transferred to still another group of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was that group?

Mr. CORTOR. I was transferred to an auto group.

Mr. TAVENNER. An automotive group or branch of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have not mentioned that branch up until the present time, have you?

Mr. CORTOR. No, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What year was that?

Mr. CORTOR. This was in 1953, the early part of 1953.

Mr. TAVENNER. Define the Automotive Branch of the Communist Party. Just what was it?

Mr. CORTOR. It was a group of people employed in the General Motors plants here in St. Louis, the branch I belonged to.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did it include more than General Motors?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes. There was one person worked out at the Lincoln-Mercury plant.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of this group of the Communist Party? What was the Communist Party trying to do in General Motors and Lincoln-Mercury?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, to try to establish themselves in a position of influence or leadership in the local union.

Mr. TAVENNER. During this period of time was Chevrolet Shell operating?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes, it was.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the practice about persons employed in Chevrolet Shell and then later with General Motors?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, the original practice, as I understood it, was that when the Chevrolet Shell plant was first put into operation there was a good-sized group of the old-timers, experienced help, that transferred out of the Chevrolet and the Fisher Body plants into Chevrolet Shell with the understanding that they retained their seniority in their old department, and that when Chevrolet Shell closed down they would transfer back to their old jobs. So that if there was ever a time when Chevrolet Shell would be reopened the labor supply would be available to reopen the plant with.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have in your membership in the Communist Party any persons who have answered that definition that you

have given, that is, persons who have returned to the General Motors plant for normal employment who might be selected to go back to Chevrolet Shell in the event that a national emergency arose and that shop would be again opened?

Mr. CORTOR. To the best of my knowledge, no. There was no one in the group I was in that would fit that definition. But if they reopened the plant to fill the rest of the jobs in Chevrolet Shell the people working at Chevrolet and Fisher Body would be given the first opportunity to fill these jobs.

So anyone working at Chevrolet or Fisher Body would fit into the categories named.

Mr. TAVENNER. So then the possibility of the Communist Party infiltrating Chevrolet Shell would depend upon how successful you were in developing membership in General Motors?

Mr. CORTOR. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know how many cells or groups of the Communist Party were organized within General Motors?

Mr. CORTOR. There was two groups.

Mr. MOULDER. In what year?

Mr. CORTOR. This was in 1953 and 1954.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether there were more than two?

Mr. CORTOR. I knew of two. I don't know whether there was any more or not. I knew of two.

Mr. TAVENNER. Could others have existed without your knowing it?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes; it is possible.

Mr. TAVENNER. But you never heard of more than the two?

Mr. CORTOR. Two is all I ever heard of.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were members of your branch in the automotive section?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, the chairman of the group was William Henry Holland.

Another member was John Simpson.

John Day was also in this group, and myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. How did you happen to find out about the second group? Was it accidental?

Mr. CORTOR. More or less.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us about it.

Mr. CORTOR. I found out the second group—

Well, I run into one individual I knew to be a member of the party, and found out he was working at General Motors. And I asked him what group he belonged to. He said he belonged to the second group.

And the other person I can identify from the second group I got to know through the defense committee. And he was also working on the same floor with me at Fisher Body.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who were in this second group as far as you were able to find out?

Mr. CORTOR. Elliott Waxman and Sol Nissen.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Elliott Waxman the chairman of that group or the head of that group?

Mr. CORTOR. I believe so.

Mr. MOULDER. May I interrupt? How did you happen to become a member of the group that you have referred to?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, by first securing employment at Fisher Body.

Mr. MOULDER. Were you directed by the Communist Party to do that?

Mr. CORTOR. Not particularly directed. I was told they were hiring. I was out of employment at that time. So I went by and was lucky enough to be hired.

Mr. MOULDER. You were told that by the Communist Party leadership?

Mr. CORTOR. By some member of the Communist Party. I can't recollect just which individual it was—that Fisher Body was hiring.

Mr. MOULDER. After you were employed, did you become a member of this particular cell or group you have referred to?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. The point I am trying to bring out is, were you requested to become a member of the particular cell or group by Communist Party leadership after you went there.

Mr. CORTOR. Yes. I was assigned—I was transferred to this group by the Communist Party after I went to work at Fisher Body.

Mr. MOULDER. I see.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is there any other information you can give the committee regarding the activities of Elliott Waxman in the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, Elliott Waxman at one time was the solicitor, and headed the Daily Worker committee here in St. Louis. And he also served as either the literature director or one of the literature directors of the Communist Party because I had occasion at times to go to him for literature for branch purposes and for other purposes. And I also secured from him—under directions I received from Mrs. Hecht—I received from Elliott Waxman a homemade mimeograph machine. It was to be used for underground purposes, so I was informed. I retained this machine in my possession until I turned it over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation just before the trial of the Smith Act defendants.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that homemade machine was obtained from whom?

Mr. CORTOR. Elliott Waxman.

Mr. TAVENNER. You spoke of his connection with the Daily Worker. What means were used to disseminate the Daily Worker among the membership here?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, by subscriptions. And those people that didn't want their home address used could pick them up at several places. I, for example, used to pick up for a while—I was picking my Daily Workers up at the Waxman's. In other words, I would use the Waxman residence as a mail drop to receive my mail and the Daily Worker.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why didn't you subscribe to the paper and have it delivered directly to your home?

Mr. CORTOR. Because I wanted to keep on living there. If I did that I wouldn't have been living there very long.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean your family would have objected?

Mr. CORTOR. Very definitely.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say there were other members of the Communist Party who also wouldn't get the Daily Worker directly?

Mr. CORTOR. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. But would get someone else to act as a mail drop for them?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did any other person that you know of act as a mail drop for the Daily Worker besides Waxman?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, after my subscription ran out I had the opportunity several times to go by the home of Ella Mae Posey and pick up a copy of the Daily Worker. I would buy them from her. Whether that was used as a mail drop or circulation point I couldn't say. But it seemed like they always had extra copies available there.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did other people get their copies there, too?

Mr. CORTOR. I couldn't say.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with the wife of W. Henry Holland?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. You testified, W. Henry Holland, was the chairman of your own group in the automotive industry?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Yes, I met her on several occasions when we had meetings at their home. And I knew her as a member of the party through personal conversation. And one evening I was there they were talking about Henry going to have to baby sit while she went to her group meeting.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know what her group was in the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. No, I do not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you active in any other front organization of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. The Negro Labor Council, the St. Louis branch of the National Negro Labor Council.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think the record should show at this point that the National Negro Labor Council was designated on January 22, 1954, by the Attorney General under Executive Order 10450.

What was the nature of your work with the National Negro Labor Council?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, mostly to help to set up the organization, try to get it on a functioning basis.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was it set up at the instance of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. As I understand it, Mr. Tavenner, in order that the record might be clarified as to your statement, this organization was on the Attorney General's designated list.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir; the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. CORTOR. My work was confined to the local council. I can't make any statement about the affiliations of any of the national people. Those people I didn't know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend any of its national conventions?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes. I attended one in Cleveland in 19—. It was the second convention of the Negro Labor Council, in Cleveland.

Mr. TAVENNER. At whose instance did you attend that convention?

Mr. CORTOR. I went up there as a delegate of the St. Louis Emergency Defense Committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean that defense committee directed you to go as a delegate to the Convention of the National Negro Labor Council?

Mr. CORTOR. To this convention; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When was this? What year was this convention held?

Mr. CORTOR. I believe this was in the fall of 1952.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether any representatives from St. Louis attended the founding convention?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes, sir. I was informed at the time I was asked to go into the Negro local to help establish the local chapter that Hershel Walker—I was informed by Hershel Walker that he and William Davis and one other person whose name I don't recall had attended the founding convention in Cincinnati.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Hershel Walker known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. Later.

Mr. TAVENNER. At a later time?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is this William Davis the same William Davis you have mentioned several times in the course of your testimony?

Mr. CORTOR. The same William Davis.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the purpose of that organization here in St. Louis, the local chapter?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, the purported purpose was to fight for the equalities of Negroes in job opportunities, and abolish Jim Crow, as they called it, and abolish any form of discrimination toward the Negro people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend conventions of any other organization at the instance of the Communist Party here?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes; I attended one meeting—this was at the—I couldn't say it was the Communist Party that sent me. A Communist Party member asked me to go, and, if my car would be available, to take a group of people.

Mr. TAVENNER. Tell us about that.

Mr. CORTOR. I attended the founding convention of an organization known as the SOS, or the Save Our Sons Committee, which was held in Springfield, Ill.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who asked you to go to that founding convention?

Mr. CORTOR. Brockman Schumacher asked me, if my car would be available, to take people up there.

Mr. TAVENNER. He was the head of the defense committee?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. The Save Our Sons Committee?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was that organization interested in?

Mr. CORTOR. They were interested primarily, or so they stated, to bring the boys back from Korea. It was a peace front.

Mr. TAVENNER. A peace front.

Do you know who was the head of that organization, or who was the principal proponent of it at that convention?

Mr. CORTOR. A woman by the name of Florence Gowgiel.

Mr. TAVENNER. G-o-w-g-i-e-l. Is that the spelling? Our investigation shows it is G-o-w-g-i-e-l.



Mr. CORTOR. It may be correct. I couldn't tell you because I never had met the woman before.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether any person from St. Louis was elected to a position or appointed to a position in that organization?

Mr. CORTOR. This individual wasn't from St. Louis. He was from out-State Missouri at that time. That was Louis Kimmel. He was living on a farm out here at Meta, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have already testified to prior Communist activities on his part, have you not?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right; yes.

And he chaired one of the sessions of this convention, and he was elected a member of the continuation committee, I believe, as representative from Missouri on the committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive any instructions at that founding convention as to what you were to do when you returned to St. Louis?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, to try to establish a local group here in St. Louis if possible, and participate with any other groups that were in the peace groups that were trying to bring the boys back. But there was no local group ever established here in St. Louis to my knowledge.

Mr. TAVENNER. I believe, Mr. Chairman, we had better recess instead of trying to finish now.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you wish to recess?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. MOULDER. Congressman Scherer wishes to be recognized.

Mr. SCHERER. Before we adjourn for lunch, Mr. Chairman, I have looked over this pamphlet that was issued on May 26 by the Emergency Defense Committee of St. Louis.

This witness just testified that the Emergency Defense Committee, up until 1954 at least, was controlled and dominated by the Communist Party.

This pamphlet, which gained some circulation in St. Louis, is a vicious and libelous attack, chiefly directed at Morgan Moulder, of Missouri, the chairman of this subcommittee.

Mr. Moulder is a Democrat, and I am a Republican. But I can say that the charges made in this sheet are untrue, unwarranted, and unfounded. Mr. Moulder is a fine American, an able Member of the Congress, and I know, as a matter of fact from my association with him, that the charges made against him in this pamphlet here in the area in which he lives are utterly untrue and unfounded, and I would class them as vicious and libelous.

Mr. MOULDER. Thank you very much, Mr. Scherer.

The committee will stand in recess until 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:40 p. m., the committee was recessed, to be reconvened at 2 p. m., this same day, there being present at the time of the recess Representatives Moulder, Frazier, and Scherer.)

#### AFTERNOON SESSION, MONDAY, JUNE 4, 1956

(The subcommittee was reconvened at 2:15 p. m. at the expiration of the recess, there being present Representatives Morgan M. Moulder and James B. Frazier, Jr.)

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

Proceed with the examination of this witness, please, Mr. Tavenner.

## TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM W. CORTOR—Resumed

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Cortor, you said that one of your early assignments in the Communist Party was to work with the unemployed groups.

Mr. CORTOR. That is true.

Mr. TAVENNER. And that one purpose of the party in doing that work was to use it as a means of recruiting people into the Communist Party.

Can you recall at this time the name of any person or persons recruited at that time?

Mr. CORTOR. No; I can't recall the names of any people that were recruited during that period. I didn't recruit any myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are there any other members of the Communist Party that you can recall now who participated in that work with you?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, there was one that I can recall at the present time. That was Richard Stanford.

Mr. TAVENNER. Richard Stanford?

Mr. CORTOR. That is true; yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any Communist Party connection with him at a later date?

Mr. CORTOR. Not Communist Party connection. I met him in the defense committee and some of the CRC meetings I attended—Civil Rights Congress meetings I attended. Mr. Stanford also would be present.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take any active part in the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. CORTOR. No. I attended some of their meetings and was a member of the Civil Rights Congress, but didn't take too active a part in it.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mentioned earlier in your testimony a person by the name of Dorothy Aukamp. Did you state that she later married?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is her married name?

Mr. CORTOR. Sage.

Mr. TAVENNER. Sage?

Mr. CORTOR. S-a-g-e.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with her husband?

Mr. CORTOR. Not at the time of their marriage, but I was later introduced to her husband by Mrs. Sage. And she introduced me to him as an oldtime party member, and she wanted me to meet her husband. I was introduced to him on that basis. He was known to me as a member of the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have heard of a cell or group of the Communist Party by the name of the Tom Paine Club of the Communist Party.

Mr. CORTOR. The Tom Paine Club was a neighborhood group that met out on—they had a store-front headquarters on either Hamilton or Hodiament Avenue. I believe it is Hamilton; about the 1100 or 1200 block.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was that during the first period of your membership?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you ever attend any of its meetings?

Mr. CORTOR. I attended several of their meetings, yes, when I would be in town off the river vessel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are there any members of that club whose names you can recall as members of the Communist Party?

Mr. CORTOR. There is one by the name of Elsie Hauber.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name.

Mr. CORTOR. I believe it is H-a-u-b-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. H-a-u-b-e-r, Hauber.

Mr. CORTOR. I also met Miss Hauber in my second period in the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. So that her membership continued on through into your last period of membership?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not certain that I have exhausted your recollection of the membership in the Automotive Branch of the Communist Party.

Mr. CORTOR. You have all the names that were in in the last period. In the early period they had several branches I was not connected with, but I knew one of the people, a fellow by the name of Tom Schmidt.

Mr. TAVENNER. S-c-h-m-i-d-t?

Mr. CORTOR. That is correct.

Mr. MOULDER. That is a very common, general name. Could you give any more identification specifically to identify that person?

Mr. CORTOR. I find it rather hard to give a physical description of an individual myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. How was he employed?

Mr. CORTOR. If I remember correctly, he was working at Ford's, and he participated in the strike of the Ford plant—it was on Park Avenue at that time—in 1938, the fall of 1938.

I also knew Mr. Schmidt in my later period in the party.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is what I was going to ask you. That is between 1951 and 1954?

Mr. CORTOR. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you give us any description or any account of his activities during that period?

Mr. CORTOR. In the later period, for a good proportion of the time, he had a job working nights, and he wasn't very active. He had a little bit of activity in the Civil Rights Congress, and some with the St. Louis Emergency Defense Committee; quite a bit of service with that.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the membership of the Communist Party advised with regard to the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, it was once put to me that the Civil Rights Congress was the legal arm of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was its membership encouraged to be active in the Civil Rights Congress?

Mr. CORTOR. It was.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what connection did you mention the name of Pearl Bernstein Starks?

Mr. CORTOR. Pearl Bernstein—

When I first knew Mrs. Starks—before her marriage—she was office secretary for the National Maritime Union, and she would be

the person that the party members would contact when they came to St. Louis for what was going on in the local party in the way of social affairs, front organizations, or anything like that. Miss Bernstein would be the person we would contact.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with her husband?

Mr. CORTOR. I met her husband during the later period, through Miss Bernstein. She introduced me to her husband as one of the old timers over the river. She wanted me to know him as a party member.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you tell the committee of any activities in which she engaged in the latter period of your membership?

Mr. CORTOR. I met him several times at Civil Rights Congress meetings, and that is about the only organization I can pinpoint Mr. Starks on.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with a person by the name of William Massingale?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes. I knew Mr. Massingale as a member of the party during the early period. And I met him several times in the later period that I was in the party. But his health was very bad, and he wasn't taking a very active part.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is in the latter period?

Mr. CORTOR. In the latter period. I knew him definitely as a member of the party in the early period.

Mr. TAVENNER. This committee received considerable evidence last year regarding the activities of the National Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case. To what extent did the Communist Party participate in that matter in this area?

Mr. CORTOR. Well, all party members were urged to support the Rosenberg committee and contact as many people as they could to ask them to write letters asking for justice for the Rosenbergs, and to help the Rosenberg committee distribute leaflets, which I did on two occasions.

Mr. TAVENNER. You participated in that work yourself?

Mr. CORTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were funds raised for the work of that committee?

Mr. CORTOR. Oh, through public donations, social affairs, movies, almost every means they could find to raise money they used.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been connected with the Communist Party in any way since 1954?

Mr. CORTOR. No, sir; I haven't.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think that is all I desire to ask the witness.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you have any questions?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Cortor, we are grateful to you, and appreciate very much your appearance before the committee in giving us the information that you have given us concerning your knowledge of the Communist activities. Thank you very much.

The witness is excused, and again thank you very much.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. James Sage.

Will you come forward, please.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Sage, will you hold up your right hand and be sworn.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony which you are about to give before the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mr. SAGE. I do.

(Representative Gordon H. Scherer entered the hearing room at this point.)

**TESTIMONY OF JAMES H. SAGE, ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL,  
GARNET W. TAYLOR**

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter my appearance as counsel.

Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is now the proper time you do it?

Mr. TAVENNER. If you will wait a moment I will see that that is done.

Will you state your name, please, sir.

Mr. SAGE. My name is James H. Sage.

Mr. TAVENNER. S-a-g-e?

How do you spell your name?

Mr. SAGE. S-a-g-e.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel accompanying the witness please identify himself for the record.

Mr. TAYLOR. My name is Garnet W. Taylor. I am a practicing attorney here in St. Louis. And the relationship of lawyer and client exists between Mr. Sage and myself. Mr. Sage was referred to me by the Bar Association of the City of St. Louis.

Mr. MOULDER. Yes, sir. And we wish to compliment you for your appearance.

And, as stated by the committee this morning, your appearance here as counsel certainly is no reflection upon you, and we are pleased to have you present here as an attorney.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Moulder.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Sage?

Mr. SAGE. I was born September 13, 1921.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where?

Mr. SAGE. In Shelby County.

Mr. TAVENNER. Missouri?

Mr. SAGE. Missouri.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. SAGE. 6048 Stoneham Drive in Berkeley, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you been a resident of Berkeley, Mo.?

Mr. SAGE. Over 2 years, if I recall correctly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you resided in St. Louis?

Mr. SAGE. Would you state the question again?

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you resided in St. Louis at any time?

Mr. SAGE. Yes, I have.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time?

Mr. SAGE. Well, perhaps since 1948, I think.

Mr. TAVENNER. Up until about 2 years ago?

Mr. SAGE. Yes, that is approximately correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been.

Mr. SAGE. I went through the grade school and the high school of Clarence, Mo. And I also have a bachelor's degree from Kirksville State Teachers College. And I also have a master's degree in educational administration from Washington University.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you receive your master's degree at Washington University?

Mr. SAGE. In February 1950.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you say when you received your degree from Kirksville?

Mr. SAGE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the date, the approximate date?

Mr. SAGE. May 1943.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you serve in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. SAGE. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. During what period of time?

Mr. SAGE. From September of 1943 until December of 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your employment has been since 1945, since you returned from the service.

Mr. SAGE. Well, I have worked at various things; as a teacher of chemistry, as a teacher of general science, as a chemist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the places and approximate dates, please.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination as guaranteed by the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question. I can't possibly see how telling us where he was employed would incriminate him unless he was employed in some criminal activity.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question propounded by counsel for the reason stated by Mr. Scherer, and the additional reason that the witness initially opened the subject by stating his occupation and employment and what he was doing.

And the reason for this direction is, as you understand, that our courts have held that the witness should be advised of such direction in order that he might know of the dangers with which he might be confronted in connection with contempt proceedings.

That is not stated in any spirit whatsoever of a threat but so that you might be advised in that respect.

Therefore, you are directed to answer the question.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. All right.

Will you state the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read the question to the witness.

(Whereupon, the record was read by the reporter as follows:)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your employment has been since 1945, since you returned from the service?

Mr. SAGE. Well, I have worked at various things; as a teacher of chemistry, as a teacher of general science, as a chemist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you give the places and approximate dates, please.

Mr. SAGE. When I returned from the service I took a position as a teacher of general science at Brookfield, Mo. That was in January of

1946. And I finished the term of schooling there, which ended in May 1946.

Mr. SCHERER. In what city was that?

Mr. SAGE. Brookfield, Mo.

Mr. SCHERER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. If you will proceed, please.

Mr. SAGE. All right.

In September of 1946 I became an instructor of chemistry on the high school and college level at Kemper Military School in Booneville, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed, please.

Mr. SAGE. On leaving Kemper Military School after 2 years of teaching there, I entered Missouri University for a half semester on the GI bill of rights. And, after going there for one semester, I entered Washington University graduate school of education.

Mr. TAVENNER. That was followed by your obtaining your degree in 1950?

Mr. SAGE. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then what was your employment after receiving your master's degree in 1950?

Mr. SAGE. Well, for a few months after that I worked at Fisher Body.

Mr. TAVENNER. In St. Louis?

Mr. SAGE. In St. Louis.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was the nature of your employment there?

Mr. SAGE. As a production worker.

Mr. TAVENNER. On the assembly line?

Mr. SAGE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you continue to work there?

Mr. SAGE. It was about 3 months; approximately 3 months, I would say, or somewhere in that vicinity.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the date when you left the plant?

Mr. SAGE. No; I do not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall the month?

Mr. SAGE. It was in the month of November.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your next employment?

Mr. SAGE. My next employment was with H. and H. Machine Shop.

Mr. TAVENNER. In St. Louis?

Mr. SAGE. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What date did that employment begin?

Mr. SAGE. I am not sure. I think it was in January or February of 1951.

Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed between November 1950, and the date in 1951 which you just mentioned?

Mr. SAGE. I was unemployed. There was a layoff at Fisher Body during—or I was laid off from there. There was a general shutdown of about 1 month in there. They are in the common habit of having shutdowns about that time of year.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you called back to work in November of 1950?

Mr. SAGE. I think I received a telegram to that nature calling me back.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you go back?

Mr. SAGE. No, I did not.

Mr. TAVENNER. Why?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make application in October of 1950 for the issuance of a passport by the State Department, a photostatic copy of which I hand you?

(Document handed to the witness and his counsel.)

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I wish to reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I ask that the photostatic copy be marked for identification purposes only as "Sage Exhibit No. 1."

Mr. MOULDER. So ordered.

(The document referred to was marked "Sage Exhibit No. 1" for identification and filed in the committee records.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine Sage Exhibit No. 1, please, and state whether or not the signature appearing on the second page is your signature.

Mr. SAGE. I wish to reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. The record should show that the witness did not even look at the exhibit before he asserted his privilege. I ask that you direct the witness at least to look at the signature.

Mr. MOULDER. Yes, the witness is directed to examine the signature to ascertain whether or not he desires to answer the question

Let the record show that the witness is now examining Sage exhibit No. 1 as requested by Mr. Scherer.

Now the question, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. The question was whether or not the signature is his signature, on this document marked "Sage Exhibit No. 1."

Will you now examine the document again, please, and state whether or not the photograph appearing on the second page of the document—

Mr. MOULDER. I don't believe he has answered the first question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Excuse me. I thought he had refused.

Mr. SAGE. What is the question, please?

Mr. MOULDER. As to whether or not the signature appearing upon the document is your signature.

Mr. SAGE. I thought I had already stated that I invoked the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you now decline to answer?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. By reasserting your privilege?

Mr. SAGE. By reasserting my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine the document again, please, and state whether or not the photograph appearing on the second page is your photograph?

Mr. SAGE (after examining document). I refuse to answer the question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination granted by the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. What was your address in October of 1950?



(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer the question, and invoke again, or assert again my privileges under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, at this point at least I cannot see how his telling us where he lived in October of 1950 could possibly incriminate him. He was still employed at that time, according to his testimony, by the Fisher Body Co. here in St. Louis. According to his testimony, he wasn't laid off until November. So I can't possibly see how telling us where he lived at that time could incriminate him. And I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed to answer the question.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, do I have any right to speak in behalf of the witness?

Mr. MOULDER. Unfortunately, the rules of our committee do not permit counsel to address the committee. In controversies of this sort you are free at all times to confer with the witness and advise him on such questions in any manner you see it.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and assert my privilege against self-incrimination as guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Sage, I will read to you this part of Sage Exhibit No. 1:

My travel plans are as follows: Port of departure: New York. Approximate date of departure: November 10, 1950. Proposed length of stay abroad: 2 months. Means of transportation: Plane or ship. Countries to be visited: England and France. Purpose of trip: Touring.

Did you engage in any travel for the purpose of touring in 1950 on the continent of Europe or England?

Mr. SAGE. What do you consider touring?

Mr. TAVENNER. Let us have your definition of it. You are the one who took the trip.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment to refuse to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. What do you mean by touring?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer the question, and assert—

Mr. TAVENNER. As a matter of fact, you didn't go to Europe for the purpose of touring at all in 1950, did you?

Mr. SAGE. I assert my rights under the fifth amendment to refuse to answer this question.

Mr. TAVENNER. As a matter of fact, you went to Europe for the purpose of attending the Second World Peace Congress which was to be held in Sheffield, England. Isn't that correct?

Mr. SAGE. I assert my privilege under the fifth amendment to refuse to answer this question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your plane was not permitted to land in England, was it? And proceeded on to Paris? Isn't that true?

Mr. SAGE. Again I assert my privilege under the Constitution to refuse to answer this question, against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. You know, do you not, that the British Government would not permit the Second World Peace Congress to be held on

British soil because of the Communist participation or Communist delegates to that convention? You know that, do you not?

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. You know that the Polish Government then invited the delegates to meet in Warsaw, and that you went to Warsaw. Isn't that true?

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your expenses to Warsaw were paid by the Polish Government; weren't they?

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. SCHERER. Is that the Polish Government?

Wasn't it the Communist Party of Poland that paid the expenses?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir; it was.

You arrived in Warsaw on the 17th of November 1950, didn't you?

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you go from Warsaw to Moscow?

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. You returned to the United States on the 8th day of December 1950, on the *Batory*; didn't you?

Mr. SCHERER. The what?

Mr. TAVENNER. The *Batory*.

Mr. SCHERER. Isn't that the same ship on which Eisler escaped from this country?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; the *Batory* was engaged for quite some period of time in work of that type.

Mr. SAGE. Are you asking a question or is this just a statement?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I asked you a question—

Mr. SCHERER. I was asking counsel a question.

But do you know that the *Batory* you took was the same ship Gerhart Eisler used to escape?

Mr. TAYLOR. Did you say counsel? You weren't addressing me?

Mr. SCHERER. No. Our counsel.

Now I am asking the witness a question since he asked me one.

Witness, do you know that the ship on which you returned to the United States was the same ship—

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I think you are properly invoking the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you meet Dr. Willard Uphaus at Warsaw?

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. TAVENNER. Dr. Willard Uphaus testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities last week in Washington, in the course of hearings which the committee has been conducting relating to the

improper use of passports, with a view of recommending legislation to Congress on the subject.

Dr. Uphaus testified that he was one of the group who attended this conference in Warsaw. And I have before me a copy of a speech he made on that occasion. In the course of his speech he said this:

Mr. Sage, one of our delegates, was arrested and fined for circulating the Stockholm petition.

Did you hear Dr. Uphaus make that statement?

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SCHERER. Was Dr. Uphaus lying when he made the statement that you were arrested for circulating that petition?

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer your question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, whether an American trade union financed your trip from St. Louis to New York and from New York to Paris.

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes, Mr. Scherer.

Mr. SCHERER. Witness, when you signed that application for passport you swore to the statements you made in that application, did you not?

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SCHERER. And isn't it a fact, Witness, that when you swore to the application saying that you were going to tour in Europe you were not telling the truth?

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SCHERER. You knew at the time you signed that application for passport and swore to the statements you made in that application that you were not going to Europe for the purpose of touring, but that you were going to Europe to attend this Communist peace conference in London, did you not?

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. SCHERER. And the fact is that you obtained that passport by, first, committing perjury, and then by fraud in making false representations to the State Department of this Government, did you not?

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination as guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. From whom did you get directions as to how to fill out this application for passport in such a way as to deceive the State Department as to the real purposes of your trip?

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination as guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. SCHERER. Isn't it a fact, Witness, that you got that information and were told how to do this by agents of the Communist Party?

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Tavenner, does the applicant state his occupation at the time he made the application for passport?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir; he does not.

Mr. SCHERER. Yes, let me see it. I saw it.

Mr. MOULDER. How is the application signed?

Mr. SCHERER. James H. Sage.

Yes, he swore to it on the 27th of October 1950, and that is before he was laid off by the Fisher Body Co.

So he knew very well at that time that he was going to this peace conference.

Now the fact is, Witness, at the time you made this application you were living at 5673 Cabanne Street, St. Louis.

Isn't that a fact?

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question and claim the privilege of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. And living at that same address was William Sentner, who was convicted in this very courtroom for violation of the Smith Act. Isn't that right?

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination as guaranteed by the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Isn't that the reason you refused to tell this committee a few minutes ago, when we asked where you were living during 1950, and you refused to give us the address? Isn't that the reason? That you were living at that time and collaborating with William Sentner?

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination as guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you here in this courtroom during the time that Sentner was being tried for advocating the overthrow of this Government by force and violence?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I refuse to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. SCHERER. The fact is you were living with him at that address on Cabanne Street at that time, were you not?

Mr. SAGE. Would you restate the question again, please?

Mr. SCHERER. I will withdraw the question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I refer again to Sage Exhibit No. 1, the photostatic copy of the passport application signed by James Harold Sage, and read an affidavit appearing at the bottom of the document.

I, the undersigned, solemnly swear that I am a citizen of the United States; that I reside at the address written below my signature hereto affixed, that I know the applicant who executed the affidavit hereinbefore set forth to be a citi-

zen of the United States; that the statements made in the applicant's affidavit are true to the best of my knowledge and belief; further, I solemnly swear that I have known the applicant personally for 4 years.

Signed "Sol Nissen", N-i-s-s-e-n.

Is that a correct statement, that Nissen had known you for a period of 4 years?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I request to answer that question, and claim the privilege against self-incrimination as guaranteed by the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I suggest, if you like, that when you are relying on the fifth amendment, as you are, that you may state that you refuse to answer on the same grounds. It would save you from repeating it each time, and it is the customary practice before this committee.

Mr. SAGE. Thank you. I thought maybe you would advise us pretty soon about that.

Mr. MOULDER. That will be permitted by the committee.

Mr. SAGE. What is the answer that you want? That I reassert the privilege?

Mr. MOULDER. If you wish to reassert your privilege under the Constitution you may, by merely saying that you decline to answer for the same reasons previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then we will understand what you mean.

On the 27th day of October 1950, was Sol Nissen known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a paper bearing date August 3, 1950, purportedly signed by James H. Sage, and ask you to state whether or not that is a copy of your application for employment at Fisher Body Division of General Motors Corp.

(Document handed to witness and his counsel.)

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you mean to take the position that an application for employment at Fisher Body might tend to incriminate you if you admit that it was your application?

Mr. SCHERER. I think so, Mr. Tavenner, in view of the fact that he has made all these perjurious statements in his application to the Government of the United States.

It is conceivable he made a false application to Fisher Body.

I think he is properly invoking the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine the application and state what it says as to educational qualifications of the individual.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I have to decline to answer the question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you return the document to me please?

(Document handed to Mr. Tavenner.)

Mr. TAVENNER. This document is marked "Hardy Exhibit No. 1." This exhibit, together with Hardy Exhibits Nos. 2, 3, and 4, was introduced in evidence during the executive testimony of Mr. George V. L. Hardy.



HARDY EXHIBIT NO. 2

APPLICATION FOR EMPLOYMENT  
FISHER BODY DIVISION  
GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION

NAME (PRINT) SAGE JAMES HAROLD  
 STREET 3647 1/2 N. MARKET CITY ST. LOUIS STATE MO  
 HOME PHONE LU 2314 OFFICE 498-12-5977 HEIGHT 5 FT. 9 1/2 IN. WEIGHT 210  
 BIRTH DATE 9 13 21 BIRTH PLACE CLARENCE MO (COUNTY) USA

EDUCATION:  GRADE 12  ABLE TO READ  WRITE  SPEAK ENGLISH  
 MARRIED  SINGLE  DIVORCED  WIDOWED  SEPARATED  6 MO BOY  
 IF YOU ARE EMPLOYED BY ANY OTHER EMPLOYER, STATE NAME AND ADDRESS:  YES  NO

RELATIVES: NONE  
 RELATIONSHIP: NONE  
 OTHER TRAINING: NONE

PREVIOUS EMPLOYERS:  
 NAME: ASSEMBLY LINE SPOT WELDING THIS PLANT WORKING ON SEAT PRODUCTION  
 YEAR OF ENTRY: 1951 NOV. 1951  
 YEAR OF LEAVING: NOV. 1951  
 REASON FOR LEAVING: TRUCKER

DATE OF ENTRY: SEP 43 DEC. '45  
 TYPE OF SERVICE: PEC. HONORABLE  
 ADDRESS: 3920 CHOUTEAU ST. LOUIS, MO  
 REASON FOR LEAVING: ILLNESS OF MY WIFE  
 ADDRESS: 4208 EASTON AVE. ST. LOUIS, MO.  
 REASON FOR LEAVING: TOO LOW WAGE  
 ADDRESS: UNION NAT. BRIDGE ST. LOUIS, MO  
 REASON FOR LEAVING: SHUTDOWN IN PRODUCTION  
 DATE OF ENTRY: AUG 50 NOV 50  
 DATE OF LEAVING: AUG. 13, 1952  
 SIGNATURE: James H Sage

HARDY EXHIBIT No. 3

Gentlemen: James H. Sage S. S. No. 498-12-5971  
 has made application for employment with us and states that he was employed by you as Paul Lane

From 1-51 To 5-51 Badge No. \_\_\_\_\_

Will you please record below your experience with the applicant. The information will be treated confidentially and we will be pleased to reciprocate. The applicant's employment may be delayed until we have your reply.

Date \_\_\_\_\_

FISHER BODY DIVISION  
 General Motors Corporation

DATES OF EMPLOYMENT		KIND OF WORK
From	To	
1/17/51	5/12/51	Crate repairer

RATING	Above	Avg.	Below
	Avg.	Avg.	Avg.
Ability			
Conduct			
Attendance			

Reason for Leaving for another job. Rehire:  Yes  No

Remarks \_\_\_\_\_

J & H Machine & Motor Parts Co. Waldenfeld 10/29/52  
Firm Name (By) (Date)

DETACH ALONG THIS EDGE AND RETURN IN THE REPLY ENVELOPE

HARDY EXHIBIT No. 4

Form 4821 -  
 Rev. 1-4-50

RETURN RECEIPT

Received from the Postmaster the Registered or Insured Article, the original number of which appears on the face of this Card.

1 James H. Sage  
(Signature or name of addressee)

2 Wm. L. Lenth Jr.  
(Signature of addressee's agent - Agent should enter addressee's name on line ONE above)

Date of delivery NOV 24 1950, 19



Mr. TAVENNER. The application marked "Hardy Exhibit No. 1" shows the name, in handwriting, of James H. Sage. It bears the date of August 3, 1950. It gives the address as 5673 Cabanne Street, St. Louis. And then it proceeds to state the educational training that the applicant has had.

Mr. SCHERER. Up to the point of giving his address, he told the truth.

Mr. TAVENNER. It merely lists "High school—12", meaning 12 grades, for his education.

It does not indicate that the applicant has degrees from two universities, or a college and a university, or that there had ever been an attendance at college.

Why was it you omitted that information from your application?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee, beginning with the witness, Mr. Herbert Philbrick of Boston, heard evidence of the Communist Party plan to colonize industry. He explained to the committee how people from the educational and professional world were being induced to colonize industry for the purpose of supplying leadership to the Communist Party.

It was not until 1954, however, that the committee, at Flint, Mich., was able to get extensive proof of that type of procedure.

Mr. MOULDER. May I add that that procedure indicated that people would be sent from New York and other points to sensitive and important defense-plant areas to work under the direction of the Communist Party leadership in New York.

Is that correct, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

There was one instance of an electrical engineer. There were instances of other persons with degrees in the type of work in which they had specialized, leaving college, or, immediately after completion of their college work, going to Flint, Mich., and taking positions on the assembly line and furnishing false information as to their educational qualifications.

And, as shown there, witness after witness testified that they did that for the purpose of becoming leaders in the labor field and in the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHERER. They made applications similar to the one that this witness made, and failed to include their educational qualifications so that they could obtain employment on the assembly line.

I was at Flint, Mich., and I remember that testimony clearly.

None of those applications with those plants disclosed that the men had degrees in engineering or master's degrees such as this witness has here.

Mr. TAVENNER. And then information was obtained in the course of hearings conducted in Denver relating to the Colorado University, that young men in the course of their educational training were induced by the Communist Party to leave school and take up places in industry, falsely stating their educational qualifications, in order to assist them in getting that type of position.

Mr. MOULDER. In view of that as a basis, I wish to ask the witness a question.

Did the Communist Party leaders or any Communist Party member influence you to make application for employment at the Fisher General Motors plant for employment there on the assembly line?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now you knew before December 10 that you were going to be laid off, that there would be this temporary shutdown at the Fisher Body plant, didn't you?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. You have just made up your mind not to answer any question that I might ask you. Is that correct?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously given.

Mr. MOULDER. Of course we are not handwriting experts, but may the committee examine the documents referred to for the purpose of comparing the signatures on the application for passport and the application for employment at Fisher?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I will very gladly hand you both exhibits.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. MOULDER. For the purpose of the record, it appears that it is the opinion of the members of the committee that the signatures appearing on both documents referred to as Hardy Exhibit No. 1 and Sage Exhibit No. 1 are identical signatures. The same person signed both documents.

Mr. SCHERER. May I ask the witness:

Is the committee correct in its opinion that the signatures on both of the documents are the same?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Sage, you actually received a notice by registered mail that you were to return for employment at Fisher Body, did you not?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer that question. He has already partially answered that question in the early part of his testimony when he said he thought he received a notice by telegram.

He certainly waived any privilege he might have.

I call it now to his attention, that it was by registered mail instead of telegram.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously given.

Mr. SCHERER. I think we should state for the record that we do not accept his answer, and that in at least the opinion of this member of the committee the witness has subjected himself to possible contempt for not answering that question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so advised, and has been previously advised of the possibility.

I say that not in the spirit of a threat but in the spirit of——

Mr. SCHERER. The Supreme Court made it mandatory that we state our feeling in order to predicate a possible action for contempt.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you direct the witness to answer?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes, the witness has been so directed.

And, as I understand the record, he declines to answer for the reasons previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Sage, after the receipt of a message to report back to Fisher Body for reemployment, did you report back?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you advise Mr. George V. L. Hardy, employment manager of Fisher Body division, as to why you had been absent and could not report back at the time you were advised to report back?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think I should read into the record at this point the testimony of Mr. George V. L. Hardy, taken in executive session on that point, and give this witness an opportunity to reply to or explain any of the matters referred to here.

Mr. George V. L. Hardy, after explaining that he was employment manager of the Fisher Body and in charge of applicants for positions, testified as to your application for employment, which he produced under subpoena duces tecum issued by this committee.

Mr. Hardy also advised that after the plant was ready to be put back in operation you were advised by registered mail to report for employment, but that you did not report.

However, under subpoena duces tecum, Mr. Hardy produced the "return receipt" for his registered letter addressed to you.

Mr. SCHERER. Addressed to him at what address? Cabanne Street?

Mr. TAVENNER. The return receipt does not show the address.

Mr. SCHERER. Who signed the return receipt?

Mr. TAVENNER. But it does show on his application, which I read into evidence a few moments ago, as being 5673A Cabanne Street.

The return receipt previously introduced as Hardy Exhibit No. 4, shows that it was signed by William Sentner, Jr., November 24, 1950.

Did Mr. William Sentner, Jr., live in the same building in which you resided?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Hardy further testified that you appeared in person in his office and gave the following explanation of the reason for your absence and your failure to return at the time you were advised to return. This is Mr. Hardy's testimony:

He—

referring to you—

stated that he left work on November 3, 1950, and subsequently left St. Louis, driving to New York, arriving on November 10, 1950. He took a Curtiss-Reid airplane which stopped at Montreal and also Gander, Newfoundland. The plane landed in Paris.

Is that a truthful statement up to that point?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

And he explained that the airline did not have a permit to land in London. So he took a local plane to London from Paris on the same day.

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a moment.

Did he state his reason for his desire to go to London?

Mr. HARDY. Yes. He gave me the information that the conference—he was supposed to go to some special conference there, but he didn't go into any further detail than that.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall what conference that was?

(There was no response.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether it was the Second World Peace Congress?

Mr. HARDY. Yes, I am quite sure that is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Very well, sir. If you will proceed, please.

Mr. HARDY. On November 11 he returned to Paris where he stayed until the 14th or 15th, on which date he stated he went to Brussels, Belgium, and then continued on the 15th to Prague. And he continued to Warsaw on the 17th, where he said he was unable to continue by plane.

To what place did you continue after arriving at Warsaw?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. Was it Moscow?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing to read the testimony of Mr. Hardy):

He then went to a port in Poland and boarded a boat which he later identified as the *Batory*.

This boat was due to land at some German port which he did not name. But he stated it was so heavily laden that it docked at Southampton first and then proceeded to the German port. It touched at Le Havre and then docked at New York on Friday, December 8. And he then flew by TWA airline to St. Louis on the same date.

Is there any error in that statement by Mr. Hardy as to what you told him on December 11, 1950?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the statements of any General Motors officials on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. Is anything said by this General Motors official, namely, Mr. Hardy, about you untrue? Did he lie to the committee on Saturday when he testified under oath as to these things that have been just read to you by Mr. Tavenner?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. SCHERER. Before we go any further, your passport specifically stated that you were not allowed to travel in Iron Curtain countries, did it not?

Mr. SAGE. What was the statement?

Mr. SCHERER. As to your passport we have been discussing, that was issued to you as a result of the representations you made in your application; that passport specifically prohibited you from traveling in Iron Curtain countries, did it not? Yet you went to Prague.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. It was at this time that you sought employment with H. & H. Machine Shop, was it not?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question with reference to his employment with H. & H. Machine Shop since in his early testimony he told us that he went to work for the H. & H. Machine Shop in St. Louis in January of 1951.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SCHERER. Is there a direction to answer the question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I believe we did invoke the amendment when you made the original question as to the matter of employment. And then you directed us to answer. We answered.

Mr. TAVENNER. That is right.

Mr. TAYLOR. Since that time there have been many questions asked, and you are coming back now to his place of employment in a different way and in a different link.

Mr. MOULDER. The record will speak for itself in that respect.

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now I hand you Hardy Exhibit No. 2, and ask you to state whether you did apply for reemployment in 1952, and if in fact you were not reemployed by Fisher Body plant in August of 1952.

(Document handed to the witness and his counsel.)

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I refer now to the reverse side of Hardy Exhibit No. 2 where the previous employment given by the applicant James H. Sage is H. & H. Machine Co. from January 1951 to May 1951.

Will you tell the committee, please, whether H. & H. Machine Co. was organized by the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. In February of 1951 were you employed as an organizer for the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Communist Party on February 11, 1951?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you receive Communist Party encouragement and support in obtaining a position as organizer for the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will stand in recess for a period of 5 minutes, at the end of which period of time the witness will be recalled for further examination.

(Whereupon, a short recess was taken, there being present Representatives Moulder, Frazier, and Scherer.)

(The committee was reconvened at the expiration of the recess, there being present Representatives Moulder and Scherer.)

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you arrested on June 18, 1951, in connection with the showing of a moving picture at the home of Eddie Richardson?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. In the course of the staff investigation it procured photostatic copies of certain papers alleged to have been in your car, in your possession at that time. That is, at the home of Richardson on June 18, 1951.

I hand you photostats of these papers marked for identification purposes only as "Sage Exhibit No. 2" as one document. I ask you to identify them as copies of notebook paper material which was in your possession.

(The documents referred to were marked "Sage Exhibit No. 2" for identification.)

(Documents handed to the witness and his counsel.)

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question, please.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you identify these photostatic copies of papers found in your possession at the time of your arrest at the home of Richardson on June 18, 1951?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question—

I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you examine the documents again and state whether or not they appear in your handwriting?

(Documents handed to the witness and his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. That is no answer. That is a refusal to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you engage in any work for the Communist Party in mass organization relating to the peace movement in the summer of 1951?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you assist in the organization of a trip of delegates from St. Louis to a convention held on June 29 and 30 and July 1, 1951, sponsored by the American Peace Crusade in Chicago?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER (referring to Sage Exhibit No. 2). I will read from some of the notes on this note paper which are numbered as follows:

No. 1. Hank Holland, H-o-l-l-a-n-d:

Going for 3 days. Will take car and will try to make up his own group.

Was that part of the delegation to this peace crusade convention in Chicago?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Hank Holland known to you at the Fisher Body plant as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Had Hank Holland been employed in the Fisher Body plant prior to November 3, 1950, while you were there?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

No. 2: Romey Hudson, (R-o-m-e-y) 4954 Fountain.

Would like to go on the 28th to be there for the opening of the meeting—

is the notation appearing under it.

Was Romey Hudson known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Both Hank Holland and Romey Hudson were identified by the preceding witness as members of the Communist Party.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Counsel, did you want an answer there?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, if you would give one I would be very happy to have it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I didn't know whether you put that in a question. I thought you were going on. Are you expecting—

Mr. TAVENNER. I live in hope always.

Will you answer the question as to whether or not Mr. Cortor was correct in his identification of Hank Holland and Romey Hudson as members of the Communist Party?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

No. 3: Loretta Waxman, Elliott Waxman, Marilyn Waxman, need transportation.

One of those names, Elliott Waxman, was identified by the preceding witness as the head of one of the automotive branch groups of the Communist Party.

Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on the grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER (reading):

No. 6 is Elsie Hauber.

Was she known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. In addition to having identified her as a member of the Communist Party, Mr. Cortor also identified Orville Leach, who is listed under No. 9 of the notes, as a member of the Communist Party.

Do you know whether Orville Leach was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Another name appearing on the notes is Bill Massingale.

Do you know whether Bill Massingale was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Pearl Starks, S-t-a-r-k-s. Was she a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Bill Sentner?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Thelma Hecht?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mrs. Holland?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Maschoff, M-a-s-c-h-o-f-f?

Mr. MOULDER. Is there a first name in connection with that?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir; there is not.

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. A person by the name of Otto Maschoff was identified as a member of the Communist Party, one of those who attended the fraction meetings in the industrial branches of the Communist Party.

Are you acquainted with Otto Maschoff?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. I also read a notation from the top of one of the notes which is underscored:

Chicago convention scheduling.

Does that refer to the Chicago convention of June 29 and 30 of the American Peace Crusade at Chicago?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. I see on another note a breakdown of names into groups, the heading of which is—

Youth to Chicago.

As the head of one of those groups is the name of Sol Nissen, N-i-s-s-e-n. That is the same name appearing as the identifying witness on your application for passport.

Did Sol Nissen accompany you to Chicago?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. On another page of these notes, there appears a breakdown of groups:

Youth, 25; professional, 15; labor—



It is impossible to tell whether it is 30 or 50.

Church groups, 15; other, 20; K. C., 50; out State 25.

What does K. C. mean?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer that question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. You know that means Kansas City, don't you?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

What does "Out-State" mean?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Isn't that the term used in the official document of the Communist Party signed by Ray Koch as the organizational secretary under date of April 14, 1947, in which he refers to a group of the Communist Party as the Out-State group, and which it was testified here this morning meant that part of the Communist Party outside of the city of St. Louis?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, as previously indicated, I ask that these notes be combined as one document, identified as "Sage Exhibit No. 2," to be retained in the files of the committee.

Mr. MOULDER. Very well.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you Hardy Exhibit No. 2, which was your application for reemployment at Fisher Body, bearing the date of August 13, 1952.

Pursuant to that application were you again given a job at the Fisher plant?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. What employment have you had since August 13, 1952?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of an organized group of the Communist Party at the Fisher Body plant at any time between August 3, 1950, and November 1, 1950?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of such an organized group of the Communist Party at any time after August 13, 1952?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have before me a photostatic copy of a document over the name of the Communist Club of Washington University, Post Office Box 1006, St. Louis, Mo. I hand you this document, and I will ask you if you have ever seen it before.

(Document handed to the witness and his counsel.)

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you play any part in the dissemination of that document?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the committee's investigation discloses that Post Office Box 1006, which appears at the bottom of it, was rented by Ralph Shaw and Jim Forrest.

Do you know Ralph Shaw?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Ralph Shaw in 1951 a Communist Party organizer in this area?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether Jim Forrest, mentioned here, is the Jim Forrest who was one of those convicted under the Smith Act in 1954?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the committee's investigation shows that a reference to William Sentner was given when this post-office box was obtained.

Mr. MOULDER. Do we have any information on Ralph Shaw?

Mr. TAVENNER. I am certain that Ralph Shaw was identified as a functionary of the Communist Party by Mr. Schoemehl in executive testimony, and I am confident also that he will be further identified during the course of this hearing.

I ask that this document be marked "Sage Exhibit No. 3," for identification purposes only, and retained in the committee files.

Mr. MOULDER. The document will be so marked.

(The document referred to was marked "Sage Exhibit No. 3" for identification.)

Mr. TAVENNER. I shall read into the record only one paragraph.

The campuses of the Nation do not exist in a political vacuum and we will find that the evils embodied in this law will strangle the free exchange of ideas which is the primary function of an institution of higher learning.

And then this part of it is underscored:

It must do this in order to capture the minds and bodies of the campus youth who are one of the major supplies of cannon fodder which is so desperately needed by Emperor MacArthur at the moment to further his fascistic aims of subjugating the people of Asia to the imperialistic exploitation of Wall Street.

Mr. SCHERER. Subjugating the people of Asia?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

The reference is to the "McCarran Act," which was a term used in 1951 to describe the Internal Security Act of 1950, which was originated by this committee. This is not the McCarran-Walter Act. It is the McCarran-Wood Act. Mr. Wood was chairman of this committee, and Mr. McCarran of the Senate committee. And the correct name was really the McCarran-Wood Act. But it is the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Was there an organized group of the Communist Party on the campus of Washington University while you were in attendance and obtained your master's degree?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. I forgot, Witness. In what field did you receive your master's degree?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer the question on grounds previously given.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. In what field?

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Congressman Moulder—Mr. Chairman, couldn't we search the record and get that?

Mr. MOULDER. You mean it has already been stated in the record?

Mr. TAYLOR. It seems to me like it was, in the first.

Mr. SCHERER. I think it was. That is the reason I was so flabbergasted that he invoked the fifth amendment. I just forgot it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Congressman, you know—

Mr. MOULDER. You are directed to answer.

Mr. TAYLOR. You directed him to answer that one particular question for the Congressman?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes; as requested by Mr. Scherer.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will you read the question then?

Mr. SCHERER. I will repeat it.

In what field did he get his master's?

Mr. SAGE. In educational administration.

Mr. SCHERER. That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the facts relating to the preparation of this document and the dissemination of it from the post office with reference to Post Office Box 1006?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer that question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. How are you presently employed?

(The witness confers with his counsel.)

Mr. SAGE. Will you state the question again, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you read the question, please.

(The question was read by the reporter.)

Mr. SAGE. As a chemist.

Mr. MOULDER. As a what?

Mr. SAGE. As a chemist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time other than those about which I have specifically asked you?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer that question on grounds previously given.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Scherer, do you have any questions?

Mr. SCHERER. You said in your earlier testimony that you for a time served in the Armed Forces of the United States. I forget what years that service covered. Would you tell me?

Mr. SAGE. It covered from August 1943, or September 1943, until December of 1945.

Mr. SCHERER. In what branch of the armed services?

Mr. SAGE. United States Army Air Corps.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you see service outside of this country?

Mr. SAGE. Yes; I did.

Mr. SCHERER. Where?

Mr. SAGE. In Italy.

Mr. SCHERER. What were your specific duties?

Mr. SAGE. Well, I suppose my classification was that of a supply clerk.

Mr. SCHERER. What did you do in the Air Corps?

Mr. SAGE. That is mainly what I did, was supply work. Just how I was classified I don't remember.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you have a commission?

Mr. SAGE. I did not.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time that you were serving this country in the Armed Forces?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer that question on grounds previously given.

Mr. SCHERER. When you were in Italy did you have any contact with members of the Communist Party?

Mr. SAGE. I decline to answer that question on grounds previously given.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. I have no questions, Mr. Tavenner.

The witness will be excused.

Call your next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Elliott Waxman.

Will you come forward, please, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Do you solemnly swear the testimony which you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mr. WAXMAN. I do.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Taylor, we wish to thank you for your conduct and appearance here as a member of the legal profession, as an attorney, at the request of the Bar Association of St. Louis, representing the witness Mr. Sage, and express our appreciation for the manner in which you have represented him as a duty on your part as a member of the legal profession.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have had the pleasure of knowing our Congressman for some years.

#### TESTIMONY OF ELLIOTT WAXMAN

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit a statement for the committee at this time. I would like to read it.

Mr. MOULDER. Yes, you may present your statement and file it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Can I read it?

Mr. MOULDER. The rules of the committee do not permit the reading of a statement, but you may——

Mr. WAXMAN. May I insert it in the record?

Mr. MOULDER. You may file the statement as a part of the files of this proceeding. The statement will be duly filed for the committee records.

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you.

(The statement referred to was filed for the records of the committee.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your name, please, sir.

Mr. WAXMAN. My name is Elliott Waxman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Waxman, you probably heard me state, when the first witness appeared, that each witness has the right to have counsel with him if he desires.

Mr. WAXMAN. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is noted that you do not. But, of course, you may have counsel at any time during the course of your testimony if you see fit.

When and where were you born, Mr. Waxman?

Mr. WAXMAN. I was born and raised in New York City; November 29, 1919.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. WAXMAN. I reside at 5867A Highland.

Mr. TAVENNER. St. Louis?

Mr. WAXMAN. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived in St. Louis?

Mr. WAXMAN. Since I was discharged from the Army in 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. Prior to 1945 where did you reside?

Mr. WAXMAN. Well, I was in the Army for a period of time.

Mr. TAVENNER. I meant prior to the time you were in the Army.

Mr. WAXMAN. New York City.

Well, I was working in Washington for a time.

Mr. TAVENNER. Washington, D. C.?

Mr. WAXMAN. Yes; that is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. For what period of time were you working in Washington?

Mr. WAXMAN. I went from New York City to Washington, D. C., and then I was there a year or two, I guess, on a job.

Mr. TAVENNER. What date?

Mr. WAXMAN. Well, I don't know the exact dates, but about 1938, I guess; 1938 or 1939.

Mr. TAVENNER. By whom were you employed in Washington?

Mr. WAXMAN. I was employed by the Federal Government.

Mr. SCHERER. Would the witness mind talking just a little louder. (Representative Morgan M. Moulder left the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. WAXMAN. I was employed by the Federal Government.

Mr. TAVENNER. By what branch or agency of the Federal Government?

Mr. WAXMAN. Defense Housing.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, how you have been employed in St. Louis since your discharge from the Army?

Mr. WAXMAN. Well, I would rather take the fifth amendment, and decline under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you refuse to answer in the belief that by answering the question it might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. SCHERER. What was the question?

Mr. TAVENNER. As to his employment in St. Louis since he was discharged from the Army.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. FRAZIER (presiding). You are directed to answer the question.

Mr. WAXMAN. I reassert the privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you honestly feel, Witness, and honestly comprehend that if you answered the question as to that employment that such an answer might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. WAXMAN. I would like to answer all the questions. I really would, but, the way I see it, I don't see how you can answer anything.

Therefore, I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. It is very simple to answer how you were employed

Now will you answer my question?

Do you honestly believe if you told this committee how you have been employed since you left the Army that those answers might subject you to prosecution in a criminal case? Do you honestly believe that?

Mr. WAXMAN. I reassert the privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, I hand you an application for employment at the Fisher Body plant under date of March 28, 1949, and ask you whether or not you have been employed there since 1949.

(Document handed to the witness.)

(Representative Morgan M. Moulder returned to the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. WAXMAN (after examining document). I refuse to answer the question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. There has been evidence produced before the committee this morning that you were the head of one of the automotive branches of the Communist Party in St. Louis while employed at the Fisher Body plant. Do you wish to deny that?

Mr. WAXMAN. I reassert the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was the testimony truthful when you were identified as the head of that group of the Communist Party?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. MOULDER. May I intervene by saying that it is often heard that in proceedings had before this committee a witness has been accused or charged with having been a member of the Communist Party or having engaged in Communist activities and is not given an opportunity to face his witness or to confirm or deny the charges that are made against him.

You are now being accorded that privilege and that opportunity.

Mr. WAXMAN. I don't feel that you have an opportunity.

I feel it would be better to go into court and have somebody proceed to put charges against you.

Mr. MOULDER. Counsel has asked you a question now—

Mr. WAXMAN. I declined to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. Giving you an opportunity to deny or affirm, and you have declined to answer the question, claiming the privilege under the amendment. Is that the way I understand you?

Mr. WAXMAN. That is right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can't you tell the truth here as well as you could tell it in any other place?

Mr. WAXMAN. I would be glad to tell the truth anywhere.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then tell us.

Mr. WAXMAN. But I decline on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you are not glad to tell the truth.

Mr. SCHERER. You submitted, at the opening of your testimony, Witness, a prepared statement that you have asked this committee to make a part of your testimony.

Who prepared this statement?

Mr. WAXMAN. Who prepared it?

Mr. SCHERER. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. I did.

Mr. SCHERER. You prepared this statement?

Mr. WAXMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. You know you are under oath now.

Mr. WAXMAN. I did.

Mr. SCHERER. Isn't it a fact that this statement was prepared at least in part with the help of some functionary of the Communist Party?

Mr. WAXMAN. What is that question again?

Mr. SCHERER. Wasn't this statement prepared at least in part by the help or with the help of some member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Then you didn't prepare this statement?

Mr. WAXMAN. I did prepare the statement.

Mr. SCHERER. You mean you typed it?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I am not asking you in this next question about who typed this statement, but did you actually prepare the language contained in this statement?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline to answer that question on the basis of the previous amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you telling us the truth a few minutes ago when you said that you prepared this statement?

Mr. WAXMAN. I refuse to answer that question.

Mr. SCHERER. Isn't it a fact that you were lying just a few minutes ago—

Mr. WAXMAN. No; I am not lying.

Mr. SCHERER. Isn't it a fact that you were lying just a few minutes ago when you said that you prepared this statement?

Mr. WAXMAN. I refuse to answer the question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. You refuse to tell us whether or not a few minutes ago you were either lying or telling the truth?

Mr. WAXMAN. A minute ago I asked you to have the same opportunity in court.

I decline to answer the question.

Mr. SCHERER. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has been.

Mr. WAXMAN. That I will be glad to tell.

Graduate, high-school graduate.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where?

Mr. WAXMAN. Well, I was graduated in New York City. I went to a trade school in order to learn something about graphic arts.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you had any other type of schooling?

Mr. WAXMAN. Yes, I had religious schooling.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have any Communist schooling?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. The committee, in the course of its investigation, has found a great many things that the Communist Party has been interested in doing in mass organization, and the different methods by which the Communist Party has endeavored to propagandize the public.

Did you take part in activity of that type?

Mr. WAXMAN. I refuse to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I am not sure that you understand what I mean.

Did you at the instance of the Communist Party, become active in any type of Communist-front organizations or mass organizations, as the Communists refer to them?

Mr. WAXMAN. Sir, I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Haven't you been secretary of a group known as Freedom of the Press Committee?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. TAVENNER. Here in St. Louis?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a paper marked for identification purposes only as "Waxman Exhibit No. 1," and I ask you to identify it.

(The document referred to was marked "Waxman Exhibit No. 1" for identification.)

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Read what appears at the beginning.

Mr. WAXMAN. You mean Freedom of the Press Committee—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. WAXMAN. Of St. Louis, Box 4473, Wade Station, St. Louis, Mo. Mr. Elliott Waxman, secretary.

Then you don't want the whole thing read, do you?

Mr. TAVENNER. No.

That says that you were secretary of that organization. Did you prepare that as secretary?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline to answer, sir, on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were secretary, though, weren't you?

Mr. WAXMAN. I refuse to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is marked for immediate release.

Mr. SCHERER. What is the date of that?

Mr. TAVENNER. It is not dated, but it shows that it relates to the year 1956 because at the bottom it says:



Mr. Morris, labor editor of the Daily Worker, will speak in St. Louis on Sunday, January 15, 1956. His subject will be, Labor and the 1956 Elections. He will appear at the Belo Hall, 1229 North Leonard Avenue, at 8 p. m. The public is invited.

Mr. George Morris was the labor editor of the Daily Worker, wasn't he?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. SCHERER. What connection did you have with the Daily Worker?

Mr. WAXMAN. I have issued a statement, and I believe the statement tells my connection.

Mr. SCHERER. I am asking a question.

Mr. WAXMAN. At the present time I decline on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. The man files a statement and tells us about his connection with the Daily Worker. He certainly has waived any privilege in that respect.

Mr. MOULDER. I don't believe the document asserts any connection with the Daily Worker. It merely comments about the Daily Worker.

Mr. SCHERER. It says [reading]:

For some time now I have been the representative of the Daily and Sunday Worker, the only working-class paper in this area.

And then:

The Daily and Sunday Worker has always been on the side of the people. Many things which this paper fought for are now the cornerstone of the American way of life.

And so on and so on.

He wasn't under oath when he gave this.

Mr. WAXMAN. Yes, I was, sir. I was sworn in.

Mr. SCHERER. I think I have the right to ask him questions. So much the better if he was under oath then.

What is your connection with the Daily Worker?

Mr. WAXMAN. I refuse to—decline to answer that question, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question. He was under oath when he submitted his statement. If he has any privilege he certainly has waived it.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. I certainly have a right to cross-examine him on the statement.

Mr. WAXMAN. I am a representative of the Daily Worker in this area.

Mr. SCHERER. You are what?

Mr. WAXMAN. I am representative of the Daily and Sunday Worker in this area.

Mr. SCHERER. For how long?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline to answer that.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question as to how long he—

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed.

Mr. WAXMAN. I reassert the privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. Witness, let me tell you in all sincerity—you do not have counsel, but I do think that you subject yourself to contempt

proceedings in view of the record if you refuse to answer now questions about your connection with the Daily Worker.

I am asking you now how long you have been connected with the Daily Worker. I am not trying to trap you because I do think you would be in contempt if you refused to answer questions in view of the fact that you have voluntarily submitted this statement to the committee.

This statement contains references to the Daily Worker and your connection therewith.

I have the right to ask you then about those statements, and test the validity of those statements and the truth of those statements because this statement of yours will be a part of the records of the committee.

Mr. WAXMAN. Well, I have been associated with the Worker for about a period of 7 or 8 years.

Mr. SCHERER. While we are talking about the preparation of documents, what part did you play in the issuance of a document which is dated May 26, 1956, just last week, entitled "The St. Louis Defender," issued by the St. Louis Emergency Defense Committee? What part did you play in the——

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Isn't it a fact you were one of those who prepared, either prepared this document or participated in the distribution of this document?

Mr. WAXMAN. I reassert the privilege, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. What help did you have from employees of the Daily Worker in the preparation of this document?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. The fact is that the document was prepared and written by the editors and employees of the Daily Worker, was it not?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline to answer that question.

Mr. SCHERER. Is it not a fact that you are a member of the Emergency Defense Committee?

Mr. WAXMAN. I reassert the privilege, sir, under the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. SCHERER. Isn't it a fact that the directing force of the St. Louis Emergency Defense Committee is the Communist Party and the Daily Worker?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Waxman, in view of the fact that you have represented the Daily Worker in this area, and due to the fact that you were the secretary of the Freedom of the Press Committee of St. Louis you are in a particularly favorable position to give this committee information as to how the Communist Party manipulates support to the Daily Worker through the Freedom of the Press Committee, if that be a fact. And I want you to tell this committee what you know about the operations of the Freedom of the Press Committee of St. Louis.

Mr. WAXMAN. Well, sir, I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you selected as secretary of the Freedom of the Press Committee by action of the Communist Party?

Mr. WAXMAN. I reassert the privilege, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. To what extent does the Communist Party control the activities of the Freedom of the Press Committee?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. MOULDER. Maybe I was absent, but do we have some definite explanation as to the Freedom of the Press Committee of St. Louis? Was that while I was out of the room?

Mr. TAVENNER. The Freedom of the Press Committee is a national organization with chapters or groups established at various places in the United States like in Minneapolis, St. Louis, and other places. And the activities of these various groups may be somewhat different.

The Attorney General of the United States, in a memorandum dated July 15, 1953, designated the National Committee for Freedom of the Press under Executive Order 10450.

Did your Freedom of the Press Committee of St. Louis give financial support to the national organization?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have a record before me of two contributions to the national organization, one from the Philadelphia Freedom of the Press Committee of \$60; and one from the St. Louis Freedom of the Press Committee for \$5.

Do you know the circumstances under which that money was sent from St. Louis?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline—I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is it the purpose of this organization, the Freedom of the Press Committee, to give financial aid and support to the Daily Worker so that the Communist Party may continue to publish it?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline to answer that question, sir, on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. MOULDER. Do I understand then that this committee, the Freedom of the Press Committee, is a recent organization specially set up for the purpose of defending the right of the Daily Worker to continue its publication and distribution?

Mr. TAVENNER. The national organization was formed by a group of 22 people in 1951. And the general purpose of it was to assist the Daily Worker. Just in what way it is assisting we don't know. This witness could tell us to what extent it represents concerted action by local membership of the Communist Party, or how they may induce non-Communists to participate in it. We don't know. This witness could tell us.

Mr. SCHERER. In connection with what you say, Mr. Counsel, I would like to make this observation and say this to the witness:

You have refused—and, I think, properly so—to answer the questions that have been asked you by counsel on the grounds that to do so might tend to inculpate you, or might tend to subject you to criminal prosecution.

I point out to you that during the 83d Congress a law was passed which gives to this committee, with the approval of a Federal court, the right to grant immunity from prosecution.

In other words, if we grant you that immunity you can answer freely any question asked you because after that immunity is granted you could not possibly be subject to prosecution.

Now, as Mr. Tavenner indicated, we feel, because of your position with the Daily Worker, because of your position as secretary of this committee, you do have valuable information that would aid the Congress and aid this committee.

Now I am going to ask you this:

If we granted you immunity would you then answer the questions that have been asked you?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. How could that incriminate you? How could answering my question, whether you would answer those questions, incriminate you if you were granted immunity?

I am saying that under no condition could you be prosecuted.

Mr. WAXMAN. I would reassert the privilege, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute.

You are refusing to answer these questions, I presume in good faith, on the ground that to answer them, if you did answer them, you might be prosecuted.

If you can't be prosecuted, if you can't be incriminated by answering the questions, we are asking you then whether you would answer them.

Mr. WAXMAN. It is not whether I would be prosecuted; it is a question of whether we have a free press in the country or not, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Is that the reason for your refusal to answer these questions?

I thought it was because you feared that you might be subjected to criminal prosecution if you answered those questions and not because of the question whether we have a free press or not.

You can't refuse to answer——

Mr. WAXMAN. We can't have a free press with people thrown in jail and intimidated and advertised as being attacked and everything else, people being told they can't read it and all that.

Mr. SCHERER. If those are your reasons for refusing to answer the questions then you are improperly invoking the fifth amendment, and not invoking it in good faith.

You can't sit here and refuse to answer questions asked by this committee on the grounds that you feel this committee is interfering in some way with freedom of the press. That doesn't give you the right to refuse to answer these questions.

You do have a perfect constitutional right to refuse to answer these questions on that ground if you conscientiously and in good faith feel that you might be prosecuted as a result of your answer.

I am beginning to wonder, from your recent answers, whether or not you actually fear criminal prosecution and whether you actually are in good faith invoking the fifth amendment.

But assuming that you are invoking the fifth amendment in good faith, and we thought you were up to this point, then if we relieve you from any possible criminal prosecution, my question is then, if you will not answer these questions.

Mr. WAXMAN. How was that last part of the question, sir, again?

Mr. SCHERER. If you are relieved from any criminal prosecution as the result of your answering the questions we ask, and are granted immunity, would you then answer the questions?

Mr. WAXMAN. I decline to answer that question on the grounds of the fifth amendment, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer.

Mr. WAXMAN. I reassert the privilege, sir.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you understand what I have been trying to say to you?

Mr. WAXMAN. I believe so.

Mr. SCHERER. You understand that. All right.

Mr. TAVENNER. I suggest that the photostatic copy of the press release of the Freedom of the Press Committee of St. Louis be marked "Waxman Exhibit No. 1" for identification purposes only.

Mr. MOULDER. The exhibit will be so marked as requested by counsel.

(The document referred to, marked "Waxman Exhibit No. 1," was filed for the information of the committee.)

Mr. MOULDER. Have you any more questions of this witness?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir; I have no further questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. I have no questions.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused.

Call your next witness, please.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you be sworn, Mr. Davison?

Mr. MOULDER. Do you solemnly swear the testimony which you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. DAVISON. Yes, sir.

### TESTIMONY OF LESLIE S. DAVISON, DEPUTY UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your full name, please.

Mr. DAVISON. Leslie S. Davison.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are a deputy United States marshal for this district?

Mr. DAVISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have asked you to produce before the committee any evidence that you have of the correct address of William Sentner at the time of his arrest in connection with the charge against him under the Smith Act in this court.

Mr. DAVISON. All right, sir.

On September 24, 1952, William Sentner was arrested in Peoria, Ill., and removed to the eastern district of Missouri, which is at St. Louis, on the 25th day of September 1952.

I fingerprinted Mr. Sentner, and on this fingerprint card which we have to make out he gave his address as 5673 Cabanne Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the address given by Mr. James Harold Sage as indicated on his passport application. It also is the same address which he gave on his application for employment at Fisher Body on August 3, 1950.

Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Thank you very much, Mr. Davison.

Call your next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Sol Nissen.

Will you come forward, please, sir.

Mr. MOULDER. Will you hold up your right hand and be sworn, please.

Do you solemnly swear the testimony which you are about to give before the subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you, God?

Mr. NISSEN. I do.

Mr. MOULDER. Be seated please.

#### TESTIMONY OF SOL S. NISSEN

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. NISSEN. Sol S. Nissen.

Mr. FRAZIER. I didn't get the name.

Mr. NISSEN. Sol S. Nissen, N-i-s-s-e-n.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Nissen, it is noted that you are not accompanied by counsel, but I think you heard the explanation I made to the previous witness about his right to counsel, did you not?

Mr. NISSEN. I did.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Nissen?

Mr. NISSEN. I was born in St. Louis, 1920.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. NISSEN. I am going to assert the privileges under the Constitution and refuse to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. NISSEN. I am going to reassert the privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you an application for employment bearing date of April 26, 1949, at the Fisher Body division of the General Motors Corp. Will you examine it, please, and state whether or not it is your application for employment.

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question, please.

Mr. NISSEN. I am going to reassert the privilege and decline to answer.

Mr. TAVENNER. This shows that your present or last place of employment was cabinet work at Modernday, Inc., in St. Louis, from 1948 to 1949. Were you so employed?

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert the privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness to answer the question. I don't see how being employed as a cabinetworker could possibly incriminate him. I don't believe the witness is invoking the fifth amendment in good faith.

I ask you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. As requested by Mr. Scherer, the witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. NISSEN. I feel that this possibly might deprive me of due process guaranteed under the fifth amendment, and I have to reassert it.

Mr. SCHERER. You say you feel that it might deprive you of due process?

Do you sincerely and honestly believe that to answer the question propounded by Mr. Tavenner might tend to incriminate you and lead to a prosecution in a criminal case?

Mr. NISSEN. I feel that the previous witness has testified against me without opportunity with full benefit of counsel to cross-examine that witness, and I feel that that question might in the future serve to aid that testimony in depriving me of due process.

Mr. SCHERER. You said a previous witness has testified against you. I don't recall. To which witness are you referring?

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert my privilege and decline to answer.

Mr. SCHERER. Whoever the witness may have been, was anything he said about you untrue?

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. You just said you do not have the right to cross-examine this witness or face this witness. Now here you are given the opportunity under oath to say—

Whatever this witness said against you, and I don't know what he said, I don't know what witness you are talking about, and I don't recall—whatever this witness said about you, you are here given the opportunity under oath to say that that witness either told the truth about you or lied about you, or explain anything you want to about his testimony. And you refuse to do so.

Mr. NISSEN. I am afraid I cannot. I am not able to cross-examine him myself, and have to reassert the privilege under the Constitution, under the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. SCHERER. Let's get an answer to my question again now.

Is there anything that this witness, whom you say testified against you—is anything that this witness said about you untrue?

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed.

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. To which witness is he referring?

Mr. TAVENNER. He is referring to the first witness this morning—Mr. Cortor.

Mr. SCHERER. What did Mr. Cortor testify about Sol Nissen? I don't remember.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Cortor testified that he was a member of the Automotive Branch of the Communist Party while employed at the Fisher Body, and that he was in Mr. Waxman's group or cell.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you present in the hearing room this morning when Mr. Cortor testified?

Mr. NISSEN. I was present; yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you hear his testimony?

Mr. NISSEN. I heard his testimony.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you hear his testimony about you?

Mr. NISSEN. Yes; I heard his testimony about me.

Mr. SCHERER. Is there anything Mr. Cortor said about you under oath to this committee this morning that is untrue?

Mr. NISSEN. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. What did he say?

Mr. NISSEN. I will have to reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. Now, Mr. Chairman, he said something Mr. Cortor testified about him was untrue. So he has opened it up. And I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so directed to answer the question.

Mr. SCHERER. What Mr. Cortor said about you is untrue.

Mr. NISSEN. I feel I am not able to cross-examine the witness. I am not prepared; I have no training to.

Mr. MOULDER. Would that enable you to ascertain whether he was telling the truth about you? You said a moment ago, in response to Mr. Scherer's question, that he did say something that was untrue. What did you have in mind when you answered that question by saying yes he did say something that was untrue?

Mr. NISSEN. I would like to have proper counsel cross-examine this witness under oath in a proper court of law.

Mr. SCHERER. You said he said something about you that was untrue. I want you to tell us. And if you do not tell us it is my honest belief that you will be guilty of contempt of this committee.

What did he say? When he said that you were a member of the Communist Party; was that untrue?

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. And you are refusing to tell us in what respect he lied about you?

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert my privilege. I can't answer that.

Mr. SCHERER. When he said that you were a member of a Communist cell at Fisher Body; was that untrue?

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. Was anything he said about your membership in the Communist Party and your activities in the Communist Party untrue?

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. I am coming back once more, giving you the opportunity, Witness, to answer. I honestly feel that you are guilty of contempt. And if you persist in not telling us in what respect, what part of his testimony about you is untrue, I am going to recommend or move that you be cited for contempt of this committee.

You have charged a man with committing perjury before this committee this morning. You have charged Mr. Cortor with committing perjury. You now have the opportunity to say in what respect. And then I will ask that the testimony of Cortor and your testimony be referred to the grand jury or the Department of Justice to determine which of you was telling the truth.

In what respect did he lie about you this morning? You have charged a man with committing perjury here this morning.

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. Well, I might say that we would have no alternative now since you have charged a witness before this committee with perjury and then have not been willing to say in what respect he did commit perjury. I think that is about the worst smear, to come in and talk about people smearing, and this committee smearing, as you put it forth in this paper that you publish here, and here you come before this committee and charge a former member of the Communist Party with perjury and then do not have the intestinal fortitude to tell this committee in what respect he committed perjury. That is about the worst smear I have heard. And I am going to move, when



this committee gets in executive session, that you be cited for contempt of this committee because I am convinced that you are in contempt of this committee.

Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your application for employment shows that your second last place of employment was McDonnell Aircraft Corp. The kind of work was sheet metal riveting and assembling. And the date of such employment was from 1945 to 1948.

Is that a correct statement of that employment?

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert my privilege under the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your application for employment shows also that you served in the Air Force between 1942 to 1945. Is that correct?

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. You are of the opinion that to tell this committee that you served in the Armed Forces of the United States might tend to incriminate you?

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. I hand you a photostatic copy of a passport application by James Harold Sage, bearing date the 27th day of October 1950, at the end of which there is an affidavit of an identifying witness. (Sage Exhibit No. 1.)

Will you examine that, please, and tell the committee whether or not the signature of that identifying witness is your signature.

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, the circumstances under which Mr. Sage applied for a passport to travel in Europe for touring when his actual purpose was to go to Sheffield to attend a Communist-sponsored, so-called peace convention?

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Your name was one of those names appearing in a notebook of Mr. Sage at the time that he was arrested on June 18, 1951, as the head of a group to take others to an unnamed destination. Was that destination the city of Chicago?

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. And did you agree to take people to Chicago to attend a convention sponsored by the American Peace Crusade?

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend the Joseph Weydemeyer School of Social Science in 1949?

Mr. NISSEN. I decline to answer that question for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you at this time a member of an organized group of the Communist Party in this city?

Mr. NISSEN. I decline to answer that for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee the work that the Communist Party is doing now to extend its organization within an industrial plant in this city?

Mr. NISSEN. I decline to answer for the same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Communist Party at this time?

Mr. NISSEN. I decline to answer; same reason.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time as to which I have not already asked you?

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Any questions, Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Scherer?

Mr. SCHERER. Witness, I don't recall whether counsel asked you at the beginning of your testimony, but where were you born?

Mr. NISSEN. St. Louis.

Mr. SCHERER. And when?

Mr. NISSEN. 1920.

Mr. SCHERER. And have you lived in St. Louis continuously since 1920?

Mr. NISSEN. Yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Have you ever been out of the country?

Mr. NISSEN. With the exception of my 3 years' service in the Armed Forces.

Mr. SCHERER. When did you serve in the Armed Forces?

Mr. NISSEN. From December of 1942 to December of 1945.

Mr. SCHERER. What has been your educational training?

Mr. NISSEN. 12 years in the St. Louis public school system.

Mr. SCHERER. No other educational background?

Mr. NISSEN. No formal educational background any more.

Mr. SCHERER. In what capacity did you serve in the Armed Forces of this country?

Mr. NISSEN. In the ground forces of the Air Force.

Mr. SCHERER. Did you receive a commission?

Mr. NISSEN. No.

Mr. SCHERER. Were you a member of the Communist Party at the time you were in the Army Air Force?

Mr. NISSEN. I reassert my privilege.

Mr. SCHERER. I have no further questions.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is excused, and may claim his witness fees.

Call the next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. John Simpson.

Mr. MOULDER. Hold up your right hand and be sworn, Mr. Simpson.

Do you solemnly swear the testimony which you are about to give before this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. SIMPSON. I do.

Mr. MOULDER. Be seated.

### TESTIMONY OF JOHN W. SIMPSON

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. SIMPSON. John Simpson.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have a middle initial?

Mr. SIMPSON. W.

Mr. TAVENNER. John W. Simpson.

It is noted that you are not accompanied by counsel. I think you have been present in the hearing room and have heard the explanation I made to other witnesses about their right to counsel.

You have?

Mr. SIMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Simpson?

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. I ask a direction.

Mr. SCHERER. Wait a minute.

I ask you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I think we should say to the witness, as we are required to say by the court decisions, that we do not accept your answer.

We feel that to refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment as to where you were born is not a proper invocation of the fifth amendment. It couldn't possibly incriminate you in any way, shape, or form to tell this committee as to when and where you were born. And if you persist in refusing to answer the question you are in contempt of this committee.

I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

Mr. MOULDER. The witness is so advised and directed, and further advised that the statement by Mr. Scherer is not in the spirit of a threat but is to advise you of the dangers which you risk in being guilty of contempt by refusal to answer the question.

Therefore, you are specifically directed to answer the question.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am surrounded by a bunch of slick operators, and I am supposed to answer your question and have it twisted all to pieces?

I continue to decline to answer that question or any other questions on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Or any questions we ask you?

Mr. SIMPSON. If I answer the question you twist it.

Mr. SCHERER. You say you are surrounded by a bunch of "slick operators."

Mr. SIMPSON. By a bunch of "slick operators."

Mr. SCHERER. If that is the reason for refusing to answer, the witness is certainly in contempt of this committee, and obviously is not invoking the fifth amendment in good faith. He doesn't even believe he is incriminated, subjecting himself to incrimination by answering the question.

Mr. MOULDER. Any more questions, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Where do you live?

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask you direct the witness to answer the question. And, without repeating what I have said before, Witness, what I said with reference to your refusal to answer the other question, applies with equal force to this question.

Mr. MOULDER. And you are so directed.

Mr. SIMPSON. I decline to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Simpson, do you want the advice of an attorney before we proceed further?

Mr. SIMPSON. I can't afford it.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the bar association be called upon to give this man assistance.

Mr. MOULDER. The Bar Association of the City of St. Louis has offered its services in providing counsel for witnesses if you so desire.

Do you so desire?

Mr. SIMPSON. I don't have the money.

Mr. MOULDER. Well, do you so desire if, without charge, the bar association provides you with counsel without charging you any fee for that service? Do you so desire counsel under such circumstances?

Mr. SIMPSON. I have no objection.

Mr. MOULDER. I ask you do you so desire.

Mr. SIMPSON. Not particularly.

Mr. MOULDER. Or so request?

Mr. SIMPSON. Not particularly.

Mr. SCHERER. Let's pursue this a little further, if you don't mind, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOULDER. Surely.

Mr. SCHERER. You knew, did you not, before you came into this room today, from the great amount of publicity that the press has given to the fact that the bar association has made available lawyers to witnesses; you knew that fact, did you not?

Mr. SIMPSON. I think I had better start refusing to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct—

Mr. SIMPSON. Because I may incriminate myself.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer.

Mr. MOULDER. You are so directed to answer.

Mr. SIMPSON. I am going to rely on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. SCHERER. Do you read the newspapers?

Mr. SIMPSON. I refuse to answer on the grounds of the fifth amendment, that I don't want to incriminate myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SCHERER. I suggest we proceed.

The witness is obviously—

Mr. MOULDER. I should first make this statement:

The committee will request the Bar Association of the City of St. Louis to appear and represent you—

Mr. SCHERER. No; I wouldn't agree to that. Not after what this witness said. He said he doesn't want any particularly. He won't tell us whether he knew about the fact that lawyers were available. We don't have to go that far, to call a lawyer in here to represent this man when he says, when he indicates that he doesn't want any, and when he won't even tell us whether he knew about the offer of the bar association to represent individuals who didn't have money.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think that we are in a position under these circumstances to stop this investigation and force a counsel upon this man, or practically force him.

(The committee confers.)

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Simpson, you are advised that the Bar Association of the City of St. Louis has offered its services, providing counsel without charge for witnesses who so request. Therefore, you are temporarily excused as a witness until tomorrow morning, giving you an opportunity to make such a request of the bar associa-

tion, at which time you are directed to reappear with counsel if you so desire.

Call your next witness, Mr. Tavenner.

That is at 9 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. SIMPSON. Do I get to collect some dough?

Mr. MOULDER. No; you are not excused yet.

Call the next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. It is going to take a little time.

Mr. MOULDER. The committee will stand in recess until tomorrow morning at 9 a. m.

(Whereupon, at 5:10 p. m., Monday, June 4, the committee was recessed, to be reconvened at 9 a. m., Tuesday, June 5, 1956, there being present at the time of taking the recess Representatives Moulder, Frazier, and Scherer.)











BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05706 3230

	a b	3231
<u>skip</u>	c d e f	3232
	g	3233
	h i j k	3234
	l	3235

Rocky Mtns pts 1-2  
Passports pls 1-4  
Propaganda pt 1  
St. Louis pts 1-4  
Save our Sons



